

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from West Virginia, is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

ORDER TO PRINT H.R. 8532

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Anti-trust Act (H.R. 8532) be printed as amended by the action of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BARTLETT ON FRIDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, after the orders for recognition for Senators that may have been previously entered have been consummated, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BARTLETT) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet on September 9, 16, 22, and 30 to consider intelligence gathering activities (S. 3517) and control of explosives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the week of September 27 concerning the operation of the grand jury system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on September 9 to consider nominations and certain legislative items.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to meet on September 13 concerning the Federal donable surplus property program and authorization for Presidential transitions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be authorized to meet on September 9 to report out legislation dealing with aviation regulation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene at 9:30 tomorrow morning.

After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the Senate will resume the consideration of the now pending congressional budget resolution, under a time limitation of not to exceed 3½ hours, with a time limit on any amendment thereto of 1 hour, and a time limit on any amendment to an amendment, debatable motion, or appeal, of one-half hour.

There will be a rollcall vote on the adoption of the resolution, undoubtedly, and there is expected to be at least one amendment offered, and probably more, on which rollcall votes would be anticipated.

Following the disposition of the resolution, the leadership would expect to call up a message from the House of Representatives on Indian education, on

which there is a time limitation. Rollcall votes will probably occur on that measure, and upon the disposition of that measure it is anticipated that a motion will be made to proceed to the consideration of the foreign aid appropriation bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 9:30 tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and at 8:24 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 9, 1976, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 8, 1976:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Ronald D. Palmer, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Togo.

IN THE JUDICIARY

Glen M. Williams, of Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Virginia, vice Ted Dalton, retiring.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 8, 1976:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The following-named persons to the positions indicated:

Margaret E. White, of Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1971.

Joseph R. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1976.

The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitments to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE HONORARY MAYOR OF SEVENTH STREET: EDDIE THOMAS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for the past 35 years, the community of San Pedro has been brightened by a remarkable independent businessman whose cheerful personality and friendliness have made him a landmark in the community. On September 23, a grateful community will gather together to honor this man, who has been named "Honorary Mayor of Seventh Street" by the merchants in his area.

He is Eddie Thomas, an 81-year-old

veteran of World War I, who operates a shoeshine stand and parking lot in the heart of San Pedro's business district near the corner of Seventh Street and Pacific Avenue. Almost everyone in town either knows Eddie Thomas, or knows who he is.

Eddie was born on July 30, 1895, in St. Louis, Mo. He was raised by his grandparents, and as a black American grew up at a time when segregation was a way of life. An active, intelligent individual, he remembers those days well, although he bears no bitterness in his heart and is aware of the progress that has been made toward making "equality for all men" a reality.

During World War I, Eddie Thomas was a member of the infantry. He was honorably discharged from the service as a private after the war, and is a mem-

ber of the Veterans of World War I, Barracks 431, of San Pedro.

After the war, Mr. Thomas worked as a cook and dining room waiter for the Illinois Central Railroad, and still possesses a letter of high recommendation from the company for his outstanding work record. In 1939, he opened his first shoeshine stand in San Pedro, located on old Beacon Street. At first, he commuted every day from Los Angeles, but he is now a San Pedro resident.

After approximately 20 years on Beacon Street, Eddie Thomas moved his operation to Seventh Street, where he has been for the past 15 years. For almost 16 years, he was accompanied by Buddie, a companionable cocker spaniel that has been dead for years, but is well remembered by Eddie's regular customers and friends.

When Eddie Thomas receives the many awards on the night of the banquet in his honor, they will represent the gratitude that the people of San Pedro have toward him. The "Honorary Mayor of Seventh Street" may sell shoeshines and parking spots, but his true contributions to the community go much deeper than that.

Through his vivacious personality, unquestioned integrity, and genuine love for his fellow man, Eddie Thomas has made San Pedro a better place to live. He truly cares about people; and in this modern age, that is a rare and valuable commodity. As an example, Mr. Thomas often sells tickets to help raise funds for local charities and causes. He never charges for his services, and his honesty has never been questioned.

Mr. Speaker, Eddie Thomas is a unique individual, the kind of man that brings happiness and good cheer to everyone he meets. On September 23, when the San Pedro community gathers to honor him, it will be a reflection of the feelings that have existed toward Eddie Thomas for over 35 years—feelings he has generated by just being himself.

DIAMOND JUBILEE OF THE BASILICA OF ST. JOSAPHAT IN MILWAUKEE

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, throughout the 200 years of our Nation's independence, and especially now in the Bicentennial Year, the American people have looked with pride and admiration upon the many landmarks and monuments which testified to the unique spirit and values of our society. One such enduring characterization of our American life is St. Josaphat's Basilica, located in my congressional district on the South Side of Milwaukee, Wis. The edifice was constructed at the turn of the century, and this year St. Josaphat's congregation is celebrating its diamond jubilee. The richly ornamental neorenaissance Roman Catholic church has fascinated architects, clergymen, journalists, and tourists for the past 75 years of its remarkable history.

In the late 19th century, America saw the influx of a large number of Poles who established numerous viable communities throughout the eastern half of the country. Eventually, these Polish-American communities, called the "Polonias," came to be distinguished by their social institutions—churches and schools, as well as social and sports clubs. The parish of St. Josaphat was therefore established in 1888 to serve as the central link in the lives of the many Polish immigrants who settled on Milwaukee's South Side.

With a membership of over 1,300 families, it soon became necessary for the Archdiocese of Milwaukee to approve the construction of a much larger church.

Due to the ingenuity and talents of Father William J. Grutza, the stones of the razed Chicago Federal Building were purchased for \$20,000, transported to Milwaukee in 500 freight cars, and transformed into an imposing structure valued in excess of \$1 million. When construction started in the summer of 1896, Father Grutza led his parishioners to dig the church's excavation with picks and shovels. The earth was carted away in wooden wagons drawn by horses, and concrete was mixed by hand and hauled in wheelbarrows to be poured in the trenches.

The exterior of the Basilica is in the renaissance style, molded with great care from the stones which once served as a governmental structure, and the interior is in the Italian Renaissance style with a touch of Romanesque. The copper-plated dome, which has turned green over the years and is visible for miles, was at the time of completion the fifth largest in the world.

A major crisis was averted in 1910 when the Franciscan order took over the administration of the church as the parish faced bankruptcy. Faced with creditors' demands, which included one proposal to remake the church into a theatre, the Franciscans worked with other dedicated parishioners to wipe out the debt. Their provision of a \$200,000 mortgage loan saved many poor workingmen who had invested money in the church and feared they would lose it.

In 1929, the procurator general of the Franciscan Order petitioned the Pope to declare the church a basilica, citing as grounds for such a decision the need to reward the many dedicated people who had given so much to build this church, and the architectural style of the building itself, which resembles St. Peter's Basilica in Rome, as well as the many works of art which had been purchased and donated to the parish. The granting of this title of basilica indicated the widespread recognition that St. Josaphat's parish had earned as a place of historical significance in its diocese.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the parishioners of St. Josaphat's Basilica, and with its pastor, Father Anselm Romb, in commemorating the 75th anniversary of this remarkable edifice. Its ageless beauty serves today to remind us all of the dedication and perseverance which have gone into the making of our American communities. The efforts of those who have made this basilica possible will remain as a constant inspiration for present and future generations to rededicate all efforts to preserve the heritage that it exemplifies.

MOUNTAIN PINE BEETLES

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress a problem that is of great concern to those of us from Colorado.

The mountain pine beetle is a parasite that normally occurs in moderate numbers in the foothills of Colorado's Front Range. In the past few years, however, the beetle population has grown to an epidemic level. I have toured the infested areas in my district, and have seen hill-sides where most of the trees have been killed by beetles. The destruction caused by this epidemic threatens the values that make the foothills of the Rockies a unique residential and recreational area.

Since the infested area is one of intermingled Federal, State, and private ownership, efforts by just one group of landowners cannot control the spread of the insects. For the past 3 years, a limited but effective suppression program has been undertaken by the U.S. Forest Service, the Colorado State Forester, and private landowners. Operating under the authority of a 1947 law that was passed because of the type of problems caused by the mountain pine beetle, the Forest Service has contributed about \$230,000 a year to the cooperative program.

Earlier this year, the Forest Service expressed grave doubts about whether it will continue even this modest assistance in fiscal year 1977. Since a high percentage of the infested area is national forest land, withdrawal by the Forest Service would end any hopes of the suppression effort being successful. Because of the grave consequences should the Federal Government not contribute to the control effort, I have been in close contact with the Forest Service about the guidelines that it is using to decide whether to participate in the coming year. I am pleased to report that the chances appear far better than they did just a short time ago that the Colorado program will include continued Forest Service participation. The ultimate decision, strangely enough, is up to the Office of Management and Budget. The Chief of the Forest Service, however, has indicated that he will support the Colorado proposal when it is reviewed by OMB.

For the information of my colleagues, I am printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some of the correspondence between the Forest Service and myself. Although these letters do not reflect the telephone conversations and meetings that we have had, they provide a good summary of the issues that are involved:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1976.

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WIRTH: This is to confirm telephone conversations between the U.S. Forest Service and your staff in which we were requested to notify you upon approval of transition quarter Federal financing for the "Colorado Front Range" mountain pine beetle suppression projects, and provide more information on our selection criteria for suppression projects.

The USDA-Forest Service has allocated \$105,000 for mountain pine beetle suppression in Colorado during the transition quarter (July 1-September 30, 1976). Of this amount, \$50,000 will be available to the Roosevelt National Forest and \$55,000 will be made available to the Colorado Cooperative Project.

Beginning with FY 1977, the Forest Insect and Disease Management Program and Proj-

ect Selection Criteria (copy enclosed) will be used to evaluate forest insect and disease suppression proposals. These criteria include evaluation of the Federal role, biological effectiveness, environmental acceptability, and economic efficiency. The purpose is to provide equitable and defensible criteria for approving or rejecting suppression proposals.

Under these guidelines, the "Colorado Front Range" cooperative mountain pine beetle suppression projects need to be strengthened to qualify for Federal cost-sharing. The principal weaknesses include definition of the Federal role and the benefit-cost analysis. In addition, there is a need to demonstrate the biological effectiveness of the treatment through a post-suppression evaluation.

To satisfy the Federal role criterion, one or more of the following conditions must apply: (1) International consequences threatened, (2) national and regional economic impacts expected, (3) Federal coordination required, (4) Federal resources threatened, (5) unique resources threatened, (6) expected benefits widely distributed beyond project boundaries, and (7) other possible circumstances not described above.

It is difficult for the "Colorado Front Range" projects to qualify under the first six conditions. At issue is the question of Federal participation where pest-related disruptions and inconveniences are local in impact and where project benefits accrue specifically to individual landowners in terms of real estate value and esthetics. We are confident that the Colorado State Forester's office, with our Regional Office in Denver, will thoroughly analyze the objectives of the project and the benefits obtained from treatment versus the adverse impacts which would result from no treatment, and determine if there is a justifiable Federal role.

The need for strengthening the economic efficiency of the "Colorado Front Range" project relates to the fact that the forest resources being protected are generally qualitative in nature and extremely difficult to value. Conversely, weak or non-existent marketing and utilization opportunities minimize the influence that timber values have on project calculations either as volume salvaged or volume protected. Fire hazard reduction and land value protection, however, are now being examined more thoroughly as a potential project benefit.

To address the economic requirements, a joint State-Federal task force recently developed a benefit-cost analysis proposal intended to provide methodology for calculating the economic efficiency of mountain pine beetle suppression projects. This analysis procedure, which will be available by mid-August, will enable us to do a much more complete job in determining economic efficiency.

The main weakness regarding biological effectiveness is the lack of a post-suppression evaluation comparing treated and similar untreated areas to determine treatment effects. The need for post-suppression evaluations is fully recognized and we are confident that plans for satisfying this need will be forthcoming.

Your interest in this matter is greatly appreciated. We assure you that the Forest Service will assist the State in every way it can in dealing with this very difficult mountain pine beetle problem in the Front Range.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. MCGUIRE,
Chief.

Enclosure.

JULY 26, 1976.

Chief JOHN MCGUIRE,
U.S. Forest Service,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCGUIRE: Thank you for your letter of July 9 regarding the Colorado Front

Range mountain pine beetle suppression projects. I am pleased to learn that transition quarter funds for the Colorado cooperative project and the Roosevelt National Forest treatment program have been allocated and approved.

However, after examining the proposed Forest Insect and Disease Management Program and Project Selection Criteria, July 1976, I am very concerned. By failing to take into account the problems unique to mountain residential areas such as Colorado's Northern Front Range and parts of Southern California, the U.S. Forest Service may be adopting very shortsighted criteria. I strongly urge that you give increased consideration to such public values as fire prevention, flood control, recreational and aesthetic value, and property value maintenance.

Both Jefferson and Boulder Counties include a large percentage of higher elevation foothill areas where private residential land is interspersed with Federal and state lands. A particular attraction in these residential areas is the large stands of ponderosa pine which are currently infested to the epidemic level by the mountain pine bark beetle. On a recent tour, I inspected some of the areas destroyed by the current epidemic and talked with many residents who are working with the control projects to minimize the effects of beetle kill to their lands and nearby Roosevelt Forest Service lands. Their concern, which I also share, is that if the funding ceases due to altered priorities, the entire Front Range is in danger of being ravaged and recent work and money spent would have been wasted. I would hope that you will carefully reconsider the proposed Project Selection Criteria so that the value of these past efforts will not be lost.

If I can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

I look forward to your early response.

Sincerely yours,

TIMOTHY E. WIRTH.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AND FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., August 6, 1976.

Hon. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WIRTH: Thank you for your letter of July 26. We appreciate your comments concerning mountain pine beetle suppression projects.

We are continuing efforts to clarify and strengthen our Forest Insect and Disease Management Program and Project Selection Criteria. Please be assured that we do not intend to ignore non-timber values or wild-fire hazards in evaluating the merit of project proposals, although more work is needed before we can adequately quantify them. We are concerned about the biological effectiveness, the economic efficiency, and the Federal role in ongoing mountain pine beetle projects. As we look ahead to FY 1977 activities, we are continuing discussions with our field people and our cooperators to be sure that all of their concerns are fully considered. In fact, our Staff Director of Forest Insect and Disease Management plans to spend next week in Colorado for that purpose.

You inquired about the possible use of Emergency Finance Assistance funds (Title X) to provide relief to landowners in the Front Range. Such funds are being used very effectively to combat insect and disease problems in other regions of the United States, for example, dwarf mistletoe suppression in Oregon and Washington and southern pine beetle suppression in Georgia, Tennessee, and Virginia.

However, we have not been able to use Emergency Financial Assistance funds to provide assistance in the Front Range because that region of the State does not suffer from unusually high levels of unemployment and therefore does not qualify for Title X funds. As you know the legislation authorizing the

Emergency Financial Assistance program has now run out, although a bill is pending that could make such assistance permanent. We will continue to be alert to any such opportunities in the future to provide assistance to landowners within the areas of mountain pine beetle infestations.

The enclosed "fact sheet" should be useful in placing the Forest Service record of involvement in perspective. We share your concerns and the concerns of the State forestry officials and private landowners. However, we also have a responsibility to make sure that the expenditure of Federal funds for forest insect disease management activities is clearly justified, whether on Federal forest lands or on non-Federal forested areas where we cooperate with the State Foresters and private landowners.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. MCGUIRE,
Chief.

Enclosure.

FACTSHEET ON COOPERATIVE MOUNTAIN PINE BEETLE CONTROL PROJECTS IN THE FRONT RANGE OF COLORADO

The mountain pine beetle continues to cause high mortality in ponderosa pine stands along the Front Range area of Colorado. Much of the damage is occurring in forested residential communities and mountain home areas.

The current outbreak of mountain pine beetle is not unique. The problem has been chronic over many years; the primary factor being that the trees are of low vigor due to crowding, overmaturity, and diseases such as dwarf mistletoe.

The long-range solution to this problem is to manage the trees in a way to improve and maintain vigor. Until this is done trees will continue to be attacked and killed and periodic epidemics will continue to occur.

Over the past several years the Forest Service and the State of Colorado have cooperated in a direct control effort which includes harvest removal of infested trees or felling the infested trees and burning or chemically treating them. Over the past 3 fiscal years the total cost of this project has been approximately \$1,618,000 with the Federal share being approximately \$699,500 or an average of 35 percent. These costs do not reflect the efforts donated by concerned private landowners who destroy infested trees on their property and do not charge the State.

The primary benefits of suppressing the beetle in this area are maintenance of private property values, prevention of increased fire hazard, and general esthetics. Due to the relatively low productivity potential of the site and the high recreational and private homeowner use the timber values are limited.

In response to inquiries by Congress and the Office of Management and Budget and the sharply rising nationwide demand for Forest Insect and Disease Management dollars over the past few years, the Forest Service is initiating the use of selection criteria for justifying Federal funds in all insect and disease management projects. These criteria will be tried and used as a guide in FY 1977 to determine where improvements need to be made. They currently include (1) definition of the Federal role—do the benefits resulting from a project apply sufficiently to the public at large to warrant the use of Federal funds, (2) is the project biologically sound—will it achieve the objectives, (3) is the project environmentally acceptable, and (4) is the project economically efficient—weighing the project costs against the benefits. In applying this latter criterion, all benefits must be considered including non-timber values such as esthetics, recreation, and fire prevention.

Based on these criteria, the Forest Service has the following concerns about the Colorado Front Range beetle project. What is the

Federal role on the private land? The benefits of suppressing the beetle on these lands accrue predominantly to the private landowner. There is some question whether Federal cost-sharing funds are warranted in this situation.

To date there has been some question concerning some of the benefits that are said to accrue as a result of the suppression projects. Past experience in working with OMB and the Department indicates that only direct or primary benefits should be claimed as part of a suppression project. Also, there have been problems associated with the particular techniques used in analyzing the economic efficiency. For example, future benefits have been claimed, yet they have not been appropriately discounted to reflect these values in present affairs.

The Forest Service has been working closely with our cooperators in an effort to develop better analytical tools for capturing all of the benefits, timber and non-timber related, that result from mountain pine beetle suppression. On June 2-3 a meeting was held in Cheyenne, Wyoming, to discuss procedures by which project benefits could be quantified. As a result of that meeting, a Forest Service-State task force has been formed to develop specific benefit-cost analysis guidelines. Hopefully these efforts will resolve many of the Forest Service's concerns regarding the economics of proposal projects.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WIRTH: This is in response to your telephone conversation on August 20 with members of my staff regarding the Colorado mountain pine beetle infestation.

The mountain pine beetle outbreak is symptomatic of a forest crisis. The bark beetles are attracted to trees weakened by overcrowding and various land use changes. Removal of surplus trees which now strain the carrying capacity of the land provides the only reasonable solution to the beetle problem. The U.S. Forest Service during the past 3 years has provided approximately \$699,500 in Federal funds for direct bark beetle control on private lands in the Front Range. Direct control is a short-term, stop-gap action, however, and will not provide the people of Colorado with the lasting relief they and we desire.

Federal cost-share funds are available for direct control when Federal role, biological effectiveness, environmental acceptability, and economic efficiency criteria required by the Office of Management and Budget are satisfied. In the past projects on the Front Range have been defended on the basis of timber values protected. Since timber is not necessarily the most important resource in the Front Range area of Colorado, these projects have become increasingly more difficult to justify. Recently, representatives from the Colorado Forest Service and the U.S. Forest Service met to explore ways of incorporating non-timber values in the FY 1977 benefit-cost analysis for the Front Range project. A system was developed which considers fire prevention and real estate, recreation, esthetics, wildlife, and water values protected or preserved. Since the interrelation between the bark beetle and many of these non-timber resources is still imperfectly understood, it is extremely difficult to assign a dollar value to anticipated project benefits. Please be assured, however, that in our review and analysis of Colorado's FY 1977 project we will give full consideration to non-timber resources.

We are optimistic that the Colorado mountain pine beetle suppression project proposal will provide good and sufficient documentation of the Federal role, biological, environ-

mental, and economic criteria required to obtain Federal funds from the OMB contingency reserve. We will make every effort consistent with the funds available and the guidelines governing our participation to support the Colorado project when it is submitted.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. MCGUIRE,
Chief.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 8, 1976.
Mr. JOHN R. MCGUIRE,
Chief, U.S. Forest Service, Department of
Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCGUIRE: Since I last wrote to you about the criteria used to judge proposals for Insect and Disease Management money, we have spoken on the telephone; I have received two letters from you; and our staffs have been in regular contact. I thank you for your continuing attention to and interest in this pressing problem.

I was extremely pleased to read the statements in your last letter that you plan to support Colorado's request for continued funding of the mountain pine beetle suppression effort, and that you are now confident that OMB will approve that request. Continuation of the good work that has been done over the last three years is essential to save our mountain forests from great damage.

I was also pleased to learn that the Forest Service is now working with the Colorado State Forester to develop guidelines to ensure that all relevant values—not just commercial timber values—are considered when OMB decides whether to fund the Colorado project for the coming year. As you are well aware, the potential for commercial timbering along the Front Range is limited. However, there are other, equally important considerations: aesthetics, recreation, wildlife, flood control, water quality, and private property values, along with the associated tax base. Continuation of the beetle control project is necessary to protect all of these values. Most important is the need to consider the great fire danger that would be posed if the beetle epidemic were to continue unchecked. As this summer's Comforter Mountain fire in Boulder Canyon demonstrated, the high combustibility of trees killed by beetles can turn what would otherwise be a comparatively minor fire into a major threat to lives and property. We were fortunate that this fire was controlled before lives were lost and property was damaged; there is no assurance that we will be so lucky in the future.

I am glad that you no longer doubt that the Colorado project is an appropriate one for federal involvement. As you said before, the beetle epidemic is not limited by property boundaries. The infested area is a crazy-quilt of intermingled federal, state, and private ownership. Since the Forest Service controls much timbered land within the epidemic area, it must be a full partner if the program is to work. This is exactly the type of situation that prompted the Congress, in 1947, to direct the Forest Service: To prevent, retard, control, suppress, or eradicate incipient, potential, or emergency outbreaks of destructive insects and diseases on, or threatening, all forest lands *irrespective of ownership*. 16 U.S.C. § 594-1 (1970) (emphasis added).

Your new assessment that the Colorado suppression project is biologically effective is also encouraging. I have personally toured control areas along the Front Range, and am impressed with the success of the efforts to limit the epidemic in those most important areas. Everyone recognizes that the current suppression effort can, at best, do no more than buy time until intensified timber management addresses the underlying problem of too many weakened trees. Until these steps

are taken, however, the current program must be continued.

Thank you for considering the use of Emergency Financial Assistance money, as I suggested during a telephone conversation with you. Although these funds are not available for the beetle control effort, I am still interested in the possibility that the suppression project could be coupled with a federal jobs program. I would be interested in learning of any suggestions you may have on this point.

I am very glad that you are now convinced that the Colorado project deserves federal support. If there is anything further that I can do, please let me know.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,

TIMOTHY E. WIRTH.

PRESIDENT JUDGE DAVID H.
WEISS—HUMANITARIAN

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay a tribute to a great American, and an outstanding jurist, the Honorable President Judge David H. Weiss of the Westmoreland County, Pa., Common Pleas Court.

On September 11, 1976, the Westmoreland County Conference of Economic Opportunity is presenting Judge Weiss with its 4th Annual Humanitarian Award. This award has become a most prestigious honor given to those who have distinguished themselves in service to their fellowmen.

Judge Weiss has indeed had a long and illustrious career in service to his fellowman and is the embodiment of the humanitarian award principles.

Following a brilliant academic career at the Monessen, Pennsylvania High School, the University of Michigan and the University of Pittsburgh, young David Weiss, the lawyer, began a life devoted to public service. He served on the Monessen School Board, in the Pennsylvania Legislature, and as an assistant district attorney. In 1958, he was elected to the common pleas bench. He has served 18 years on the bench, the last 9 as president judge. Judge Weiss has gone before the people in 22 separate elections and has received their approval each and every time.

In addition to his elevation to justice and the law, Judge Weiss has been very active in many civic and fraternal organizations. He originated the Adam Eidemiller Awards program, and the Judge David H. Weiss Athlete-Scholar Award, both of which honor outstanding high school youths of Westmoreland County.

Mr. Speaker, David Weiss, the lawyer; David Weiss, the State legislator; David Weiss, the civic activist; and David Weiss, the brilliant judge, has been in service to his fellowman for over 40 years. He has consistently and repeatedly placed unselfish devotion to duty over personal considerations and has always been true to his personal motto, "he serves God best who serves his fellowman". Mr. Speaker, it is very appropriate that this outstand-

ing American, Judge David H. Weiss, be honored with such a prestigious award for he truly is a great humanitarian.

MORE ON RESISTANCE TO COMMUNISM IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, 1976, on page 14973 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I discussed the subject of the continuing resistance to communism in Southeast Asia. Again, the London Daily Telegraph, in an article appearing in its August 28 issue, reports on continuing resistance in Laos. Particularly significant is the news that Gen. Vang Pao's army is still resisting, as is the news that Cuban mercenaries are apparently now part of the scene. One wonders how many thousands of Communist troops it will take to subdue this small nation? I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

SMUGGLERS DEFY PATHET LAO GUNS

(By Denis Warner, at Khung Chiam, Ubon Province, North-East Thailand)

A magnificent banyan tree shades a village lookout platform above the rising waters of the Mekong and the last stretches of the river that Thailand jointly claims with Laos.

The platform provides an uninterrupted view of the river to the North and to the South to where the Mekong swings east, deep into Laotian territory.

A year ago the river here was still a lively place. It had always been more of a bridge than a barrier and the long, slender pirogues sped across it in scores.

Families on both sides intermarried and the ties established paid no heed to national boundaries. Today the pirogues at Khong Chiam huddle close to the shore and the fishermen cast their nets only at the mouth of the Mun, which joins the Mekong.

RUN GAUNTLET

Only at night do the boats slip across the river along almost the whole length of the Thai-Lao border. For a fee of 1,000 baht or \$50, (\$27) they run the gauntlet of the Communist Pathet Lao guns to smuggle out the never-ending flow of refugees.

Officially, fewer than 100,000 refugees have entered Thailand from Laos, yet officials along the River Provinces say the true total is two to three times as high. Tens of thousands from Laos have found refuge with Thai relatives.

Thai officials do their best to persuade the Laotians to return home. The Laotians are not interested, although some have gone back—to fight the Pathet Lao.

In one province I met a young Laotian who had entered Thailand the previous day after nearly a year with a guerrilla band of 350.

HEAVY ACTIONS

Thai officials tend to dismiss the fighting in southern Laos as sporadic and guerrilla in character compared with the heavy actions that have been going on for months north of Vientiane, the capital.

There, the remains of Gen. Vang Pao's Meo army of tribesmen appear to be heavily equipped and have engaged the Pathet Lao forces in major actions.

But the battles fought by the southern

guerrillas are far from small-scale. "We put 200 men into an action early this week," the young guerrilla said. "The Pathet Lao were moving arms and ammunition at Songkhon, east of the Mekong, and about 30 miles from Pakse. We killed 13 of the Pathet Lao and burnt three of the trucks. The rest escaped and ran back to Pakse."

In another recent action the same group of guerrillas lost 15 killed and 30 wounded and claimed to have killed 56 Pathet Lao.

He claimed that Vietnamese forces were in the southern Laotian towns in considerable numbers. Russian technicians and Cuban guards to look after them have also appeared in the Mekong river towns. A Thai official said: "I think the Russians don't feel safe. That's why they've brought the Cubans in."

KILLED OLD PEOPLE

It is difficult to nail down the sort of cruelty by the Pathet Lao that is so commonplace in the talk of all the refugees. One young man, who ran his own English school in Savannakhet, said the Pathet Lao had killed even old people and babies. But he had not himself seen these killings.

An attractive 20-year-old girl named Vanida, who acted as interpreter, reached Thailand after telling her parents she could stand life under the Pathet Lao no longer. She said they had taken people's belongings, even their chickens, and were sending all the young people to the countryside to work.

The Thais, officially, know nothing. They desperately want to establish some sort of *modus vivendi* with their communist neighbours in the three Indo-China states. With Cambodia they have succeeded. With Laos and Vietnam they may never be successful, since both are helping the Thai insurgents in the north and north-east.

LABOR DAY

HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, no date on the American calendar is so definite a turning point as Labor Day. It is more than the end of summer and its pleasures—it is everybody's private New Year—the signal for real life to begin again.

Labor Day is the turning point of getting down to business regarding work, political, or otherwise, and also begins the all-out open campaign of the exciting and great drama of a Presidential election.

My colleagues, I would like to take this moment to hail the occasion of Labor Day honoring the tremendous contributions of the American working man to the cause of the Republic.

From American shops, factories, mills, mines, and farms, have flowed the greatest abundance of all time, and American workers have produced it all. But that is not the sole accomplishment of labor. Social and economic justice is as much a goal of the average working man as food on the table. In times of stress as well as times of prosperity, the free trade unions of America are devoted to the interests of the disadvantaged few who, alone among our millions, have yet to experience prosperity. Every segment of the American community must help

in this endeavor, in which the labor movement has played so prominent a role.

By vigorous employment of our vast national wealth, energy, and intelligence, we will reshape American society in such manner that, eventually if not tomorrow, a useful and productive life shall be the birthright of every American citizen.

That is the promise of the American labor movement, and one requiring the respect of everyone. In many ways, the social and economic gains of all America are part and parcel of the grand advances by labor in the current century. Economic gains, old-age pensions, industrial safety laws, and the social security system—all were supplied largely in answer to labor's demands. And who is to deny that social gains—such as extended franchise rights and civil rights—and educational gains—such as modern public school systems—are not a blessing to the land. These, too, were supplied, in large part, in answer to the protests of labor against educational and political inequality, at the expense of working men and their families.

In honor of the workers themselves, and their organizational activities, I join with millions of others in hailing their performance, as a symbol of America in action and the glory of their cause.

ON BOARD THE U.S.S. "MOINESTER"

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the last decade has witnessed a growing dissatisfaction with the Federal Government and its insensitivity to the problems and needs of the individual. Frequently, the armed services has been the object of this general discontent. As a result, I find it reassuring to receive a letter from one of my constituents, the vice mayor of South San Francisco, which indicates his very positive experience on board the Navy frigate U.S.S. *Moinester*, while in Italy. It is especially important that the American people become aware of the many valuable contributions which are made by our armed services throughout the world. Therefore, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the very thoughtful letter received from Vice Mayor Emanuele N. Damonte after his recent visit with American servicemen abroad:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RYAN: On July 4th, we, two Councilmen and the Mayor of South San Francisco, were on vacation in Italy. At that particular time, we were in Taormina, Sicily, and were feeling a little low in that it was our Country's 200th birthday and we were so far away.

Fortunately, in the bay were two United States Navy Frigates. We were able to make contact with some officers of one of the ships, the U.S.S. *Moinester* (DE 1097), who invited us to board the ship for a tour. The reception we received from the ship's Officer, LCDR Ollie LaJole, was great. Mr. LaJole was the Officer in charge while the

Commanding Officer, Lieutenant Commander Alemlan, was not on board.

Would it be possible for you to inform LCDR Ollie LaJoie's superior officer of the courtesies extended to us by LCDR LaJoie and the men of the U.S.S. *Moinester*. There were fourteen of your constituents in our party who were quite impressed with the polite, well-informed, well-disciplined men of the U.S. *Moinester* and appreciated the fine treatment we received.

I must say, it was a great feeling to be on United States territory seven thousand miles from home on the 200th anniversary of our country's birthday.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUELE N. DAMONTE,
Vice Mayor.

GIVEAWAY TO BREWERIES

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 2, the House wisely rejected H.R. 3065, a bill providing tax subsidies to a majority of the Nation's breweries, when it was brought up under suspension of the rules. This legislation, opposed by both the Treasury Department and the Tax Reform Research Group, would set a dangerous precedent of misusing the tax code to alter competitive conditions within industries. H.R. 3065 would provide a tax rebate of up to \$120,000 each year to approximately 40 brewers. Many of these companies are thriving without this unique tax subsidy; others are owned by huge conglomerates which would ultimately benefit at the taxpayers' expense.

The Ways and Means Committee devoted only a few minutes to this precedent-setting bill, hearing only from the bill's sponsors and the lobbyist for the brewers, who properly referred to H.R. 3065 as our bill. It is unfortunate that the valuable time of the House may be wasted on reconsidering this unwarranted special interest legislation when so many vital measures are competing for consideration on the floor.

I am confident that the House will resist the pressures from the breweries and their lobbyists and defeat H.R. 3065 should it come to the floor again for action. I have attached, for the information of my colleagues, a copy of the testimony on this matter which I delivered before the Committee on Rules on August 31:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT F. DRINAN BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RULES CONCERNING THE PROPOSED RULE ON H.R. 3065

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee in opposition to the closed rule on H.R. 3065 requested by the Committee on Ways and Means. Frankly, I am disappointed in that Committee for requesting a rule on H.R. 3065, rejected by the House on August 2nd, when so many vital measures are competing to be considered on the Floor.

The proposed bill would provide subsidies of up to \$120,000 per year to a majority of the nation's brewers through a reduction of

their federal excise tax liability. According to the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, the legislation is designed to enable small brewers to compete more effectively with larger companies. Closer examination, however, reveals that the bill will provide an undeserved windfall to a number of thriving companies at taxpayer expense without altering the competitive structure of the beer industry in any way.

The Pearl Brewing Company of Texas would be one of the beneficiaries of this tax subsidy should H.R. 3065 become law. Yet Pearl is far from a small, struggling business; it is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Southdown, Inc., a Louisiana conglomerate with revenues exceeding \$300 million and profits of more than \$36 million in 1974.

Another potential beneficiary, Champale, Inc., is owned by a Delaware conglomerate, Iroquois Brands Limited, which owns six other companies as well. Iroquois made \$3.65 million in 1974 without special tax subsidies. The Lone Star Brewing Company of Texas, which earned \$3.66 million in 1974 on sales of \$42 million, is another thriving firm which would receive more than \$100,000 annually from the Federal Treasury should this bill become law.

Mr. Chairman, I can see no justification for giving these and other brewers a unique tax subsidy on the pretext of making them more competitive. Even if all of the potential beneficiaries of this special interest bill were in financial trouble, this bill would not enable them to compete more effectively with the giants of the industry. As the Brewers Association of America, the lobbying organ of these brewers, testified before the Ways and Means Committee, "the small brewers have been unable to build the modern, efficient plants due to lack of financing and as a result they cannot produce malt beverages as cheaply as their larger competitors." This proposed annual giveaway of \$120,000 will not enable small brewers to build these huge modern plants. It therefore cannot succeed in fulfilling its avowed purpose.

Mr. Chairman, the enactment of H.R. 3065 would set a dangerous precedent of misusing the tax system to alter competitive conditions within industries. If we can do this for brewers, why not for wineries, candy-makers, and other companies throughout the economy? As the Treasury Department observed in its adverse report on the bill, "The trend in the beer industry is no different from that of most other consumers goods. . . . If this principle were once incorporated into the excise system, it could become the basis for tax measures which would interfere with the efficient distribution of resources and the development of new techniques or systems." Yet the Ways and Means Committee spent only a few minutes hearing testimony on this critical proposal. I believe far more careful consideration is necessary before we set this significant precedent.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, if this bill is to be brought back to the House Floor for a second chance, it should be subject to amendment to remedy some of the defects I have outlined above. Certainly, large corporate conglomerates which own small breweries as subsidiaries should not be permitted to qualify as beneficiaries of this legislation. Neither should those companies which earn millions of dollars in profits annually without this proposed bonanza. Yet, if this bill reaches the Floor on a closed rule, Members will be precluded from offering any amendments to the bill. They will be faced with the choice of giving \$120,000 to Southdown, Inc., or denying subsidies to all.

If competition has been unfairly stifled in the beer industry, there are anti-trust laws on the books which should be rigorously applied. Subsidized loans are, of course, available to breweries and all other small

businesses in genuine need of assistance. H.R. 3065 constitutes nothing but an outright gift of \$5 million of the taxpayers' money to firms in a chosen industry. It is poor legislation which has already had its "day in court" and lost. I urge this Committee to reject the proposed rule and focus its energies on bringing before the House those key bills which we must pass before the 94th Congress adjourns.

Mr. Chairman, although he could not be here personally, our colleague, John Moss of California, requested that I inform the Committee that he concurs in the testimony I delivered this morning.

TRIBUTE TO THE U.S. LITTLE LEAGUE CHAMPIONS—CAMPBELL, CALIF.

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to pay tribute today to the 1976 Campbell, Calif., Little League All-Star team which earned the title of U.S. Little League Champions on August 28 in Williamsport, Pa. These outstanding young men, whom I have the honor of representing in Congress, defeated teams from across the Nation in establishing themselves as the best Little League team in America.

Theirs is an inspiring story of determination, dedication, and desire; of molding their God-given individual talents into a united and forceful team spirit; of striving to be the very best team in all the land; and of succeeding in realizing their goal. Theirs is a story of making new friends, seeing new places, and learning what it takes to reach a level of excellence which is reserved for a privileged few.

All of America can be proud of these young men; and the residents of Campbell can be especially proud of the way the team represented their city, the State of California, and the United States at the Little League World Series. It is the second time the city of Campbell has sent a team to the finals, but it is the first time they have welcomed their team back home as U.S. champions.

This is an honor which these young men will never forget, and I join the citizens of Campbell in extending my congratulations to the team manager, Jack Zogg; the coaches, John Emery and Bob Holman; to the parents, whom I am sure made many sacrifices and offered continual support to their sons; and, last but not least, to the following members of this championship team: John Aimonetti, Rich Alvarez, Dominic Costantino, Scott Freear, Curt Hollars, Brian Hughes, John Lawson, John Murphy, Rich Okamoto, Ed Rodriguez, Paul Sargis, Bob Straight, Al Vanegas, and Mike Walsh.

I hereby respectfully request that all Members of Congress join me in extending these congratulations and offering this well-deserved tribute.

KOREA'S MISGUIDED CRITICS

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to place in the RECORD an excellent column written by Mr. Rowland Evans and Mr. Robert Novak, which appeared in the Washington Post of Wednesday, September 8, 1976.

In my opinion, this article very lucidly explains the machinations behind the recent barbarous events in the Korean DMZ, when two American officers were so brutally murdered while going about the peaceful pursuit of trimming a tree that was interfering with the visibility of both sides.

Since this event, there have been veiled suggestions in the press and in this Chamber that perhaps the only way to avoid further hostilities of this sort is to pull all of our troops out of South Korea, thus abandoning the ROK to the same and inevitable fate that so recently has befallen other Asian nations, such as Cambodia and South Vietnam.

It is quite true that we might prevent further shedding of American blood in Korea by copping out on our obligations there, but in the light of what would be certain to happen, have we really become so irresponsible? I am not one who says that we should defend democracy everywhere in the world, at whatever cost.

But have we reached in this great land the white-bellied point that we expect democracy to survive at no cost at all?

That not only would be totally unrealistic, it would be a shameful position for America, still the leader of the free world, to take.

I have also observed that some critics of our Korean policy are trying to advance the idea that South Korea deserves whatever happens to her because its government, in the face of a hostile, dedicated enemy only 24 miles away, allows slightly fewer freedoms than those enjoyed by safe and comparatively carefree citizens of the United States.

I cannot believe that even the least intelligent of these critics actually expects anyone to believe that the citizens of South Korea would enjoy more freedoms under a government run by North Korea's rabid dictator, Kim Il Sung, the same man who treacherously sent soldiers out to kill and wound our men with axes.

What inspires these critics of South Korea I really hesitate to say. The obvious conclusion as to why they might want South Korea weakened and abandoned to a forlorn destiny is too uncomplimentary to them to utter at this time. However, if there is any other conclusion to be drawn, or any other motive behind talk of South Korean abandonment, I have yet to perceive it.

Along with the Evans and Novak column, I would also like to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington

Star of September 5, 1976, and I would also, at this time, like to quote an excerpt from that article.

It is headlined, "How Free Would America Be If the Enemy Were Right at Your Door?"

In part, the article says:

When the United States was at war, it saw fit to limit travel, job changing, it rationed gasoline and other necessary commodities. In some circumstances constitutional liberties such as habeas corpus were suspended, in others whole ethnic populations were incarcerated. And this took place in a country which counts its democratic experience in centuries rather than decades; this took place in a land where the enemy was 6,000 miles away rather than poised two dozen miles from the nation's capital.

The reality of the Korean situation just does not submit to Utopian yardsticks.

I echo that. Yet many critics of South Korea keep wanting to apply this utopian yardstick to South Korea, for reasons of their own, reasons which, as I have said, I am almost fearful to deeply contemplate.

I introduce both of these articles now in the continuing hope that with enough exposure of the truth, and with a constant stating of the obvious, perhaps the misguided critics of South Korea will eventually come to their senses. As the old hymn puts it, if we put a light in the window, it may help the wayward sinner to find his way home.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 8, 1976]

THE KOREAN INCIDENT: AN ORCHESTRATED PLOY?

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Contrary to hints from the State Department that Moscow and Peking secretly helped avert a new Korean war, non-political government experts believe the recent crisis was a ploy orchestrated by North Korea with limited political goals in mind.

There is no hard intelligence of any intervention by either the Soviet Union or Communist China that prompted the North Korean expressions of regrets for the murder of two U.S. army officers. Rather, there is a strong feeling among Pyongyang-watchers here that North Korea dictator Kim Il Sung never wanted the provocation of Aug. 18 to escalate into warfare but intended it for political effects, both in Korea and the U.S.

Thus, instead of triumphantly demonstrating the value of detente, the events in Korea were part of continued Communist pressure on one of the world's most dangerous flashpoints. The reaction on Capitol Hill, combined with the overall political climate here, should encourage North Korea to keep up that pressure.

The most obvious goal of the Aug. 18 incident was to draw attention to Korea at the recently completed non-aligned nations conference in Colombo, Sri Lanka, and the forthcoming United Nations General Assembly session. For the longer range, however, Kim's targets were political opinion, at home and among his enemies.

Troubled by grave economic problems in North Korea, Kim is believed by experts to have fomented a crisis to firm up national morale.

At age 64, the Korean despot is in questionable health, troubled by a visible growth on his neck which is getting alarmingly large. The designation of his eldest son, 36-year-old Chong Il Sung, as heir apparent has not proved popular with the party apparatus;

the succession is now in doubt. Accordingly, the time-tested device for diverting attention from domestic discord is to generate a unifying foreign threat.

In the hermit state of North Korea, there is no quick way to determine whether Kim's bloody ploy fulfilled its domestic goals. It is clear, however, that it largely achieved its foreign purpose: to raise new doubts among Americans about their seemingly endless Korean commitment.

Beneath public expressions of outrage over Pyongyang's largest atrocity were private complaints on Capitol Hill that American blood was too precious to spill for Park Chung Hee's authoritarian South Korean regime. Indeed, events following the Aug. 18 incident indicate development of an anti-South Korea congressional bloc on the model of the old anti-South Vietnam bloc.

Just as the House international affairs committee was about to adopt a resolution condemning North Korean actions, Rep. Don Fraser of Minnesota proposed an additional paragraph condemning South Korea's sentencing of political prisoners. Amazingly, the committee adopted it. Fraser, who has become the scourge of Seoul, on Sept. 1 won committee approval to subpoena South Korean diplomats and their documents.

That same day this question was raised by Rep. Robert Drinan of Massachusetts in a House floor statement attacking the sentencing: "Should the United States that gives massive economic and military assistance to South Korea confess that it has no sanction for this type of indefensible conduct?" While the Frasers and Drinans propose ending all aid as a sanction, Jimmy Carter talks of a staged withdrawal of all U.S. ground forces from Korea (though lately he has promised to first consult Japan).

Enjoying this favorable political climate, Pyongyang-watchers believe Kim never had any intention of escalating the murder of the Americans into a war for the entire peninsula. Besides, his notions of attempting a lightning seizure of Seoul last year following the fall of Saigon were vetoed by both Communist superpowers.

Nevertheless, some close students of the Korean scene deduce that Kim, author of so much bloody mischief in East Asia for a generation, would never issue his first apology for anything without pressure from the Russians or Chinese. That deduction, however, is not backed up by facts. Officials at the highest level say there is simply no intelligence of any such intervention.

In his declining years, Kim Il Sung may have moved from sheer brute force to a mixture of brute force and political maneuver. Experts here believe his immediate goals will be to encourage sentiment inside the U.S. advocating a Korean pullout while seeking bilateral U.S.-North Korean negotiations, leaving out the South Koreans. That may prove more difficult for U.S. politicians to resist than a naked military threat.

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 5, 1976]
HOW FREE WOULD AMERICA BE IF THE ENEMY WERE RIGHT AT YOUR DOOR?

(By Hancho C. Kim)

The outrage which followed the slaying of two unarmed U.S. Army officers in Korea's demilitarized zone last month is both an appropriate and justified response to an act of barbarity.

The incident serves to illustrate the complexity of Korean reality today. The ax murders do not stand alone, but rather are part of a long chain of sabotage and subversion which serves to unsettle any easy hopes for textbook political development on that long-troubled peninsula.

To understand the hostility present in Korea, one does not have to think all the

way back to the 1950 invasion and war there. In the past few years, for example, the world has seen the tunneling under the DMZ from the north, the murder of President Park Chung Hee's wife in an assassination attempt on Park himself, the beating of an American soldier at Panmunjom, and the thwarted commando raid on Park's presidential residence.

Simply put, the people of Korea are seeking to better their lot in circumstances of tension, apprehension and bloodshed. Nonetheless it stands as a tribute to those involved that South Korea has a burgeoning economy, shows a dramatic increase in per capita income, and in turning one of the more barren areas of Asia into one of high promise.

The suspension of certain civil rights and the imprisonment of a number of dissenters by the Park regime has inspired a measure of criticism in this country.

Some Americans express concern that the United States associates itself as a nation with a less-than-perfect democracy. These Americans fear a loss of reputation worldwide as a result of this association. This argument is unrealistic and selectively applied. The harsh reality of the North cannot be ignored. Furthermore, one must remember that the role of the United States would be a lonely one if it were limited to councils of those nations living up to this standard of impeccable democracy—possibly England, Canada, Switzerland and the San Marinese.

America's rapprochement with Communist China is widely counted as a major diplomatic triumph of our times. But the Chinese path to development continues to be at a staggering price in lives, freedoms and living styles. The response to dissent there hardly compares favorably to the ideal behavior Americans seem to demand of South Korea. The yardstick seems unfortunately flexible.

The comparison between the Koreans is even more striking. Presumably even the most intense critics of Park's discipline of the press, students and certain clergy would not wish the North Korean version to become the rule on the whole peninsula. The public executions, the horror stories brought out by the Pueblo crew are evidence enough of the enlightenment of the regime in the North.

Talk comes easy when one is not obliged to carry the burden of it. President Park, for his part, is ready to carry the responsibility for his actions in seeking to hold his country free and together in circumstances which can only be seen as a state of war preparedness.

When the United States was at war, it saw fit to limit travel, job changing, it rationed gasoline and other necessary commodities. In some circumstances constitutional liberties such as habeas corpus were suspended, in others whole ethnic population groups were incarcerated. And this took place in a country which counts its democratic experience in centuries rather than decades; this took place in a land where the enemy was 6,000 miles away rather than poised two dozen miles from the nation's capital.

The reality of the Korean situation just does not submit to Utopian yardsticks. Although not happy with the circumstances, nonetheless Park Chung Hee and his government live in the real world and the president has managed to keep his nation together while at the same time overseeing its rapid economic development.

Park is, in a Korean sense, a Lincoln-like phenomenon—a man dedicated to his nation, a man singularly free of pretensions and of unchallenged personal honesty. Park is far more aware of the awesome responsibilities destiny has laden on his shoulders than of any of the privileges of rank it has accorded him.

He commands the loyalty, and even the

love, of the overwhelming majority of the Korean people. Three-quarters of the eligible voters endorsed him in the referendum of February 1975.

The strength and character of the Park regime stand between the glowing Korean economy and a precipitous flight of American aid, a renewal of military action by North Korea in the field and consequent panic realignment of Asian nations with what they then would regard as more reliable allies.

Idealists and theorists will see the necessity of living in a real world in regard to Korea. We must settle for the level of democracy the Koreans can provide. If we insist upon more, we may crash down the democracy they have laboriously built up—and we may easily kill their taste for democracy altogether.

CLEVELAND DENTIST DIES; GAVE 51 YEARS OF SERVICE TO COMMUNITY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow and deep regret that I come before you today to announce the death of an outstanding citizen of Cleveland, Ohio, and a close friend and associate. Dr. Henry W. Hunter, a respected dentist and community activist, died yesterday at Metropolitan General Hospital in Cleveland. I had great admiration for Dr. Hunter. His unselfish devotion to his profession and to his community won him the respect of citizens from all walks of life.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hunter was on the dental staff of St. Vincent's Charity Hospital for more than 25 years. During that period, he volunteered his services to that hospital's dental clinic so that low-income families could benefit from the best possible dental care.

Aside from the practice of dentistry, Dr. Hunter became involved in civic pursuits. In 1967, he served as foreman of the Cuyahoga County grand jury. He was also nominated by the present mayor of Cleveland to a seat on the old Cleveland Transit Board in May of 1975.

Mr. Speaker, last year, Dr. Hunter was named one of the area's top five senior citizens by the Cuyahoga Senior Citizens Council.

In addition, Dr. Hunter served as president of the Improved Benevolent Protective Order of the Elks of the World. His work with the Phyllis Wheatley Association and National Foundation, the Jane Hunter Committee, and Tau Boule Sigma Phi Fraternity kept him constantly on the go.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to call upon my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join with me in extending our condolences to the Hunter family. Let us also acknowledge Dr. Hunter's long record of excellence in the practice of dentistry. His contributions to the people of Cleveland and the black community will be remembered for years to come.

ISRAELI RESCUE MISSION AT ENTEBBE AIRPORT

HON. JEROME A. AMBRO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. AMBRO. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I cosponsored House Concurrent Resolution 680, a resolution commending "the courage, skill, and execution" of the Israeli rescue mission at Entebbe Airport. With this one valiant act, the tiny nation of Israel has become a world leader in the battle against international terrorism. As Israeli Defense Minister Shimon Peres stated:

The mission in Uganda . . . strengthened the backbone of the Jewish people and of the whole free world.

For the past few years, the world has been cowed and shocked by a new breed of international criminal; the terrorist. These people have displayed the most wanton disregard for human life. They boast of a record that includes the cold-blooded murder of Israeli schoolchildren and athletes, the mailing of letter bombs, and countless cases of kidnapping of innocent civilians whose lives are to be bargained for the freedom of the perpetrators of other heinous crimes of terror. Since 1968, over 800 persons have been killed and some 1,700 injured in such terrorist incidents, yet the forces of international law—and even the so-called superpowers—have been impotent to bring these murderers to justice.

On July 4, 1976, however, a mission of terror failed. On that day, Israel took its place in the forefront of the forces of freedom and legality. Displaying inspiring elan and vitality, its people demonstrated to the world exactly how international criminality should be treated—with forthright courage. Now it is up to the United States to follow the Israeli example. Just as our forefathers defeated the Barbary pirates, we must increase our efforts toward the defeat of the Palestinian pirates.

How is this to be done? One part of the worldwide battle against terror has been convincingly displayed by the Israeli commandos at Entebbe. By setting the precedent of meeting blackmail with decisive action rather than meek compliance, and by establishing the principle that no asylum can be viewed as safe for international criminals, the Israeli raid represents a strong deterrent against future terrorism.

We must, however, do more. Even while we praise the Entebbe raid, we must strive to eliminate the necessity for future rescue raids. This resolution requests that the President initiate negotiations with other nations "to help prevent acts of terrorism by, among other means, denying assistance or asylum to persons who perpetrate acts of terrorism, and by invoking sanctions against any nation which gives assistance or grants asylum to such persons." Such negotiations, if successful, could deal a

death blow to terrorism. The reason is simple: without assistance from established governments, in the form of refueling hijacked planes, granting asylum to terrorists, or helping terrorists guard hostages, terrorism would be nearly impossible.

The collusion between the Palestinians and Idi Amin during the most recent incident is indicative of the high degree of cooperation from established regimes that is required for terrorism to succeed. According to all reliable reports, Uganda supplied additional weapons to the hijackers, Ugandan soldiers intermittently relieved the terrorists of their guard duties, Idi Amin embraced the leader of the hijackers upon arriving on the scene, and Uganda allowed additional terrorists to join the original hijackers at Entebbe. If most of the world were now applying economic sanctions to Uganda, perhaps others would be dissuaded from following a similar path in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the Entebbe raid was an inspiring blow for legality and international order. Though some nations, predicating their foreign policy on their desire for oil or oil revenues, have tried to twist the meaning of the incident, we in the United States understand fully what the Israeli action signifies. It represents a great victory over the forces of criminality, and for that we heartily applaud the Israeli people. In addition, it demonstrates once again my contention that only a strong, confident Israel can work for a peaceful solution to the Middle East conflict.

I join with most of the free nations of the world in applauding the Israeli action, and with Israel's Government and citizens in mourning those who gave their lives in pursuit of freedom.

STATEMENT ON U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN IRAN

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Ms. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the tragic deaths of American civilians working in Iran raises in bold form serious questions about America's very large involvement in Iranian matters. These American civilian technicians, numbering in the thousands, are in Iran because the U.S. Government has undertaken, in a secret agreement that did not receive executive branch review, to supply Iran with the best and most sophisticated armaments that we possess for our own defense.

The civilian technicians are in Iran, much as military personnel, to assist the Iranians with integrating this equipment into their armed forces. Of course, recent congressional studies indicate that this is only the beginning of a sizable American presence in that Middle East nation.

Saddened as all of us are at the violence that took the lives of these Americans, we must, I believe, look at this incident as proof positive that our very significant commitment to Iran has very

real byproducts and that as such both the Executive and the Congress are obligated to review this involvement before we find ourselves hostage to circumstances we did not fully anticipate. It seems, in sum, that substantial commitments that result in tacit approval of large numbers of American citizens being present in foreign locations obligates us in the Congress to look rather carefully at what this all means. Failing to do that, I fear we fail in our obligations.

With these very serious matters in mind and the tragic deaths of American citizens at hand, I offer for my colleagues' consideration a report of the events of the recent past:

THREE U.S. MEN MURDERED IN TEHRAN (By William Branigin)

TEHRAN, August 28.—An Iranian guerrilla squad today ambushed and killed three American civilians who had been working in Iran under a contract with the Iranian air force.

American sources said the three, employed by U.S. defense contractor Rockwell International, and been involved in a sensitive missile project.

They were assassinated at about 7 a.m. as they were being driven to work at an Iranian air force installation in a crowded industrial and residential district of southeastern Tehran.

Iranian authorities blamed the murders on the Islamic-Marxist guerrillas, a group that they said is financed by Libya and trained by the radical Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine.

The ambush was a carbon-copy of one in May 1975, in which two U.S. Air Force colonels, Paul Shaffer and Jack Turner, were executed by the same group.

The attack marked the first time that American civilians have been targets for guerrillas opposed to the one-man rule of Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi, American sources said.

It also comes at a time of new congressional scrutiny at increased U.S. business involvement with the Iranian armed forces. There are currently 24,000 Americans, including dependents, in Iran, many of them employed by more than 40 U.S. firms with Iranian military contracts.

In today's attack the gunmen, said to number four or five and driving a Volkswagen, cut in front of the Americans' chauffeur-driven car and ordered the driver to get out. They sprayed the car with automatic weapons fire, killing William C. Cottrell, 43, Robert R. Krongard, 44, and Donald G. Smith, 43, all of California. The attackers then fled.

An Iranian government spokesman said witnesses had recognized the gunmen and he vowed, "the police will find them."

The American embassy said the Iranian government had assured it "that every effort will be made to bring the terrorists responsible to justice."

U.S. Ambassador Richard Helms, a former CIA director, said in a statement, "This brutal and mindless crime serves no cause and demonstrates the heartless cruelty of the perpetrators."

[A White House spokesman in Vail, Colo., where President Ford is vacationing, said "The President is deeply saddened by the senseless murder of three Americans in Tehran. The brutal attack against innocent civilian Americans is tragic evidence of the need for renewed efforts to cope with senseless acts of violence. It is the President's hope that the murderers will be apprehended and brought to justice."]

The shah expressed his "sincere regrets" and sent envoys to the homes in Tehran of the men's families.

The U.S. defense community in Iran, which includes more than 4,000 military personnel and dependents plus thousands more civilians working under Iranian military contracts, put its members on alert and advised them to alter their routes to work and avoid conspicuous social gatherings.

U.S. sources said the men had been experts on aircraft missiles for Rockwell, which owns the Northrop Aircraft Corp. The American embassy said they had been working on "a research project."

[The National Broadcasting Company reported that the three Americans were installing a secret electronic intelligence-gathering system code named "Project IBEX," estimated to cost up to \$500 million. It said Cottrell had joined Rockwell last year to be overseas manager for the project and that another of the victims, it did not identify which, was engineering manager.]

Besides the two U.S. colonels killed in the same fashion last year, guerrillas gunned down Air Force Lt. Col. Lewis Hawkins in 1973 as he was walking on a sidewalk in downtown Tehran.

With the help of the CIA and U.S. military intelligence agents, American sources said, the Iranian secret police, SAVAK, captured 11 members of the Islamic-Marxist Guerrillas and charged them with all three murders. Nine of the guerrillas, including a woman, were executed by firing squad last January after military trials. Iranian authorities said all had confessed to the crimes.

The authorities have also blamed the Islamic-Marxists for killing at least 30 other persons, including an Iranian general, and wounding scores more.

So far this year at least 76 alleged terrorists have either been executed or killed in bloody, to-the-death shootouts with police.

After the latest of these battles this spring, the Iranian government announced that it had destroyed the guerrillas' main secret headquarters in Iran and crushed their organization.

But U.S. intelligence sources expressed skepticism since more guerrillas than had been killed or captured were understood to have been trained in Libya and dispatched to Iran via circuitous routes through Western Europe.

The latest killings come as a shock to the American community here, estimated by the U.S. embassy to be about 24,000 and growing fast.

It was the first time in more than a year that guerrillas in Iran had gone on the offensive, and again the targets were Americans. A Senate Foreign Relations Committee report released earlier this month said the number of Americans in Iran "could easily reach 50,000-60,000 or higher by 1980."

Friends of the murdered men said they had been easy targets because they never varied their route to work, as American authorities advise U.S. personnel, especially those in defense-related jobs, to do.

An employee of Bell Helicopter International, which trains Iranian servicemen under a huge sales and support services contract with the War Ministry, said the firm had ordered company buses to vary their routes to work but that most Americans do not take the precaution because it is too much trouble.

The bodies of Cottrell, Krongard and Smith will be returned to the United States after a few days, American pastor Robert Pryor said.

Cottrell is survived by a wife and two teenaged children. Krongard leaves a wife and three children and Smith is survived by his wife.

THREE AMBUSH VICTIMS AMONG 24,000 AMERICANS IN IRAN

Rockwell International, three of whose employees were machinegunned to death in Tehran yesterday, is one of more than 40 U.S.

companies working on military contracts in Iran.

The U.S. embassy in Tehran estimates that 24,000 Americans are currently in Iran, about two-thirds of them in Tehran.

But a Senate report published last month said the embassy's estimates appeared to be conservative, and predicted that 11,000 Americans would be working on military projects alone in Iran by 1980, with 50,000 to 60,000 Americans, including dependents in the country.

The Senate report said Iran had bought \$10.4 billion in U.S. military goods and services since 1972, and Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger told a news conference in Tehran earlier this month that rate would continue through 1980.

The two largest U.S. military-contract operations over the next several years will be Bell Helicopter International and the Grumman Aircraft Corp., the report predicted.

Each company is expected to have more than 2,000 American employees and dependents in Iran.

Bell is training pilots and mechanics for the Iranian army, which is engaged in a \$4 billion program to modernize and expand its helicopter fleet from 400 to 800 aircraft.

Grumman's presence centers on Iran's purchase of 80 F-14 jet fighters, at a cost of \$2.33 billion, including Phoenix missiles.

In addition to the private contractors, many of whose employees are retired military men, there are currently more than 4,000 Defense Department military and civilian employees, including dependents, in Iran, the largest U.S. military-aid mission anywhere.

COMPULSORY STERILIZATION IN INDIA: INEVITABLE FAILURE OF A SHORTCUT POLICY

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year reports have come from India about plans for legislating compulsory sterilization in several of its most populated states.

Now comes news that the state of Bombay has adopted, with the apparent approval of the central government, new laws which will permit authorities to forcibly sterilize men and women within 180 days of the birth of their third child. The law will go into effect when it has been given final approval by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and her government.

On August 25, our colleague from New York, the Honorable EDWARD I. KOCH, took the floor of the House to condemn this action as inhumane and reminiscent of certain practices of Nazi Germany. I commend him for a very thoughtful statement on the issue and join him in recommending that the United States consider cutting off all assistance to India should compulsory sterilization become a reality there.

Beyond the moral aspects of the practice are the practical consequences, which are not likely to be within the expectations of those Indians who advocate compulsory sterilization. A recent article which appeared in the June 1976 issue of the Hastings Center Report points out the problems which such a policy is likely to encounter.

The author is Dr. Michael Henry, asso-

ciate for education at the Hastings Institute of Society, Ethics, and the Life Sciences in New York and codirector of its Population Research Group.

In his article, Dr. Henry makes a strong case for the inevitable failure of a shortcut policy such as compulsory sterilization as a solution for India's pressing population problems. Because of the pertinence of his argument, I am placing it in the RECORD at this point and urge my colleagues' attention to it:

COMPULSORY STERILIZATION IN INDIA: IS COERCION THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE TO CHAOS?

(By Michael Henry)

Inevitably compulsory sterilization will be introduced in India in an attempt to reduce significantly the rate of population growth. But just as inevitably, the program will fail.

Although New Delhi and the state governments have so far stopped short of outright coercion, legislation is pending in Maharashtra and Punjab, with federal approval, which would impose jail sentences on couples if both partners remain unsterilized after the birth of their third child. Since the Gandhi government is now almost a dictatorship, such legislation could be passed easily. Public figures who might have protested loudly are either in jail or effectively silenced; and army and village leaders seem to support the government, enhancing the chances of enforcement.

Indian officials justify compulsory sterilization on the grounds that the very survival of the country is at stake. They argue that continued unchecked population growth (over 30,000 births daily) will lead to mass starvation, rampant disease, social breakdown, and chaos. In extreme times, their argument goes, extreme measures are necessary. Freedom and individual rights must be traded off for survival.

This argument, however, that coercion must be employed to assure survival, is not self-evident. It requires justification on ethical grounds. Besides considering the nature and extent of the particular coercion, one would also have to take up the difficult task of comparing the supposed welfare of future generations with the certainty of definitive coercive measures against those presently living. Our actions clearly have enormous impact on future generations, but how far does our moral obligation in this matter extend? We at least should not pass on a world worse off than the one we inherited, a world slipping backwards toward catastrophe. But that does not resolve the issue in India; the Indian peasant is, if anything, slightly better off today compared with his father—even after twenty years of high population growth. If chaos is imminent, there should be more obvious signs.

Impending catastrophe is not the only grounds on which coercion may be justified, of course. To move 80 percent of India's population from an extremely dismal living state to a very dismal living state over twenty years is no great achievement. To enable marked improvements in the life of Indian peasants to occur over twenty years instead of a hundred may be justification in itself.

However, coercion also entails potential moral and political consequences. Compulsory sterilization, even if only partially enforced, will force some people into conforming while others, living in fear of the government, might turn to bribery and other evasions in order to avoid compliance. In turn, a dictatorial government could use the law selectively to punish dissidents and political opponents. Ultimately the increase in corruption and cynicism invites further disloyalty to the government. The poorest and most powerless would be most affected, since they are least likely to be able to buy out of or otherwise evade the government "nets."

The program could also further undermine whatever respect exists for the practice of family planning itself, and weaken whatever cohesive forces and values presently hold the society together. On the international level, the introduction of coercion will weaken recent documents signed by India, such as the UN Declaration of Human Rights and the World Population Plan of Action, as well as damage the relatively recent global movement toward voluntary adoption of family planning.

Furthermore, ethical positions should be at least partly dependent on available factual information, and we are now beginning to gather information on measures that might reduce population growth rates. The recent experiences of South Korea, Taiwan, and West Malaysia suggest that for many poor countries a number of concurrent reforms are necessary. Income redistribution, lowered infant mortality, improved literacy, and readily available family planning services and information may be insufficient in themselves, but together they constitute a "package" which significantly improves the lot of the poorest so that smaller families become a more attractive alternative.

In the face of this admittedly preliminary evidence, coercion is certainly not the only route away from chaos. But the "package" alternative is expensive and gradual, and provides few short-term indications of improvement. The natural tendency is to look for a shortcut. When a number of governments rushed to introduce or endorse national family planning programs in the mid- and late-60s, the major rationale was that these programs were a shortcut to socioeconomic development. Population growth (of say 3 percent) was seen to sap economic growth (of say 5 percent) so much that economic improvements had little impact. Provision of family planning services was seen as a means to remove this obstacle to development. The disappointing response to these family planning programs led to the introduction of positive and negative incentive schemes to increase motivation for adopting contraception—payments for "motivators" and "acceptors" and taxes on the N + 1 child, for example. The impact of incentives on birth rates has been equally disappointing. When leaders think only in terms of shortcuts, coercion seems a natural next step.

Ironically, it is precisely because reproductive coercion is a shortcut that it will not succeed. India, like other poor countries, has a long history of nationally-planned development programs which have failed in implementation. Confusing and sometimes contradictory policies and programs have resulted from the polyglot of very different states and castes. Corruption saps effectiveness. And, as the national Minister for Health and Family Planning admits, the lack of an adequate "administrative and medical infrastructure" makes policy implementation difficult.

To implement successfully an effective compulsory sterilization program will require complicated record keeping, readily available health facilities, and a highly committed police force or army. India has over one million people in its armed forces, so one of these requirements may be met. However, even regular bureaucratic recordkeeping is unpredictable at best, and the lack of an adequate health infrastructure (one doctor for over 4,000 people, one hospital bed for 1,500 people) is one of the causes of the failure of the family planning program itself.

If India were ready for the successful introduction of compulsory sterilization, it would also be ready for development, since much the same infrastructure is required. Socioeconomic reforms need to accompany a family planning program so that individuals will be motivated to use the program. Such reforms are more long-term and costly, but

to bypass them with compulsory sterilization simply delays them and makes them even more expensive.

The Gandhi government has embarked on a course of action which can only lead to the introduction of compulsory sterilization. Yet the very problems which constitute the rationale for that action will prevent compulsory sterilization from affecting the birth rate markedly. What then will the government do when even its strongest population policies fail?

THE "ATLANTA DECLARATION" AND SCHOLARLY EXCHANGES WITH THE SOVIET UNION

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1976, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an item dealing with the unfairness of our so-called scholarly exchanges with the Soviet Union. This item appeared on page 18123. The concern over these cultural exchanges was first expressed in the so-called Atlanta Declaration issued on May 27, 1976, in Atlanta during the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, by certain persons expressing a common dissatisfaction over the inequality of the exchanges. The declaration, presented in the form of a petition to the International Research and Exchange Board—IREX—which handles these matters, has received a rather chilly reception, but the points it makes are still valid in my view. The text of the declaration follows for the edification of my colleagues:

ATLANTA DECLARATION

To: Congress, American Council of Learned Societies, Ford Foundation, International Research and Exchange Board (IREX).

From: Scholars Concerned about Cultural Exchanges.

We the undersigned, specialists in Russian and Soviet culture, respectfully solicit your assistance in urging Congress to implement the following:

(1) Publication of the criteria used by the International Research and Exchange Board (IREX), funded by the State Department, Ford Foundation and the American Council of Learned Societies, to determine the allocation of exchange facilities to recognized academic disciplines. (How many historians? How many physicists?)

(2) Publication of an independent audit conducted by the General Accounting Office (GAO) or similar appropriate body of the quantity of man-months spent in unimpeded research calculated by disciplines at appropriate facilities by Soviet exchange scholars in the United States and American exchange scholars in the USSR since 1959.

(3) Implementation by the International Research and Exchange Board (IREX) of the principle that the US-USSR Cultural Exchange is to operate on the basis of equal labor time (e.g., man-months) expended in appropriate research facilities, access to which is guaranteed by the host country.

(4) Establishment of an insurance program to compensate scholars for lost labor time if access to appropriate facilities guaranteed by treaty is unreasonably delayed (e.g.,

more than 30 days after arrival in the host country).

(5) Establishment of a monitoring service, independent of IREX and the State Department, to invigilate implementation of cultural exchange agreements between the US and countries of different social systems, such monitor to have and enjoy diplomatic status in counterpart countries while present in the performance of his duties, and to report directly to the Congress on an annual basis.

(6) Negotiations of multiple entry visas for scholars exchanged under provisions of existing cultural exchange agreements.

TRIBUTE TO RUTH KIRZON GROUP FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, INC., 30 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING HUMANITARIAN SERVICE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct privilege and pleasure to pay tribute to the Ruth Kirzon Group for Handicapped Children, Inc., located in the Bronx, N.Y., which will be celebrating their 30th anniversary on October 30.

For three decades the dedicated volunteers who work for the Ruth Kirzon Group have provided a wide range of important services for handicapped children in the Bronx. Included among their services is their annual scholarship awards for outstanding handicapped high school graduates. This year 10 scholarships were awarded. The scholarship committee is headed by Jean Wachpress and Ruth Gladstone.

Remarkably, the Ruth Kirzon Group has existed and succeeded for the past 30 years without the benefit of Federal, State, or local assistance. They utilize the services of hundreds of volunteer personnel who are all united in their concern and compassion for handicapped children.

Organizations such as the Ruth Kirzon Group are really what America is all about; namely, people working with and for other people. The Ruth Kirzon Group has provided opportunities for handicapped children to live a productive life. Their employees seek no monetary reward, their reward comes in the form of the satisfaction which they get helping those less fortunate than themselves.

I wish to both commend and congratulate the fine human beings who make up the Ruth Kirzon Group for Handicapped Children, Inc. I especially wish to pay tribute to the officers of the group—President Sylvia Caston, First Vice President Sonya Cantor, Second Vice President Mollie Katz, Third Vice President Frances Rosenbaum, Treasurer Florence Vogel, Recording Secretary Nancy Bentley, Corresponding Secretary Blanche C. Riflin, and Financial Secretary Hannah Deutsch. All of these women deserve special praise for the leadership they provide.

I extend my best wishes to the Ruth Kirzon Group on this important event in

their history and wish them continued success in the future. Allow me to quote one of their mottoes which will help my colleagues to understand the Ruth Kirzon Group as it is:

It is the firm and unshakable belief of the more than 300 dedicated volunteers of the Ruth Kirzon Group that charitable assistance, properly given to a handicapped young person, assures the development of an adult who is independent and self-sufficient.

THE MYTH OF THE CRUISE MISSILE EXPOSED

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it seems now that the debate over the B-1 bomber will proceed interminably. The arguments have become tedious as harmful misrepresentations by those who waffle on our Nation's security are made again and again.

One such fallacy is that the B-1 would cost \$92 billion. In reality, 244 of these strategic bombers will cost about \$30 billion, or 1 percent of the defense budget during its expected 30-year lifetime.

Another widely publicized deception is that the cruise missile would be the perfect alternative to the concept of a manned bomber. Careful study of the situation proves otherwise.

Opponents of the B-1 suggest that 50 of these small missiles launched from a wide-bodied aircraft like the Boeing 747 would be more cost-effective. The truth is that, for the aircraft component alone, \$60 million per plane would be required to make the necessary modifications and improvements.

Furthermore, a cruise missile defense would not be ready until the late 1980's at best. This delay would assure Russian superiority during that decade.

The story also begins to crumble when cruise missiles are examined for survivability. For an excellent discussion of their inability to defeat enemy targets, I am submitting for the RECORD an article by William C. Moore which appeared in the September 3 Los Angeles Times. "Cruise Missile Misfires as a Substitute for B-1" presents a voice of reason and factuality rarely heard in this emotional debate. It makes clear that our forces must include the B-1 if we are to be assured strategic parity, and ultimately the opportunity for survival:

CRUISE MISSILE MISFIRES AS SUBSTITUTE FOR B-1

(By William C. Moore)

The B-1 bomber is now in a holding pattern. It was put there this week when a House-Senate conference committee agreed to fund the controversial supersonic aircraft at a minimal level until the next President can decide whether to switch on the afterburner and really get the plane moving.

Meanwhile, as debate over the project intensifies, the thrust of the opposition argument will still go something like this: The B-1 is simply unnecessary, for the so-called

cruise missile will assure our defensive posture well into the 1990s, obviating all the expense and bother of developing a new generation of supersonic bomber.

Cruise missiles certainly have their potential but some of the claims made for them give pause. Are they really as good as all that?

According to their most ardent supporters, these weapons—which are, essentially, small winged aircraft carried, in folded form, by larger planes—have the potential to revolutionize modern warfare by reversing U.S. dependence on nuclear capability.

The reason is that these highly accurate yet inexpensive missiles would enable the United States to respond to a Soviet attack without using nuclear weapons. If it is true, moreover, that cruise missiles can be effectively carried and fired by B-52s—or even 747 jumbo jets—then that eliminates any essential role for the B-1 bomber, as some media commentators and even some military strategists are maintaining.

But high hopes for the cruise missile raise two vexing questions.

One requires response by those aforementioned “experts” of the press, the other by professional military men who will have to prove in combat whether such optimism is justified.

The first question: *Do official reports of the Department of Defense reflect the optimism widely voiced in the popular press?*

The answer is no. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld agrees with his predecessor, James Schlesinger, that the cruise missile still needs proof of concept. Both have suggested, however, that the missile has promise if used in a supplementary role to increase the future utility of B-52s attacking lightly, as opposed to heavily, defended targets.

According to both Rumsfeld and Schlesinger, a research and development program for the missiles should be continued because they involve promising new technologies in engine design, fuel use and navigational accuracy while flying at extremely low altitudes—technologies that could well be useful in developing future, better weapons.

The second question: *How effective will the cruise missile be in combat?*

To military commanders, the answer is fundamental. It matters not whether the cost is high or low. Hitting the target is what counts.

The concept of cruise missiles is not new: The German “buzz bomb,” or V-1, which struck targets in England during the latter phases of World War II, was an early version of the cruise missile. During the 1950s the United States itself deployed several cruise-type missiles—the Matador (later redesignated the Mace), the submarine-borne Regulus, and the intercontinental SNARK. Ultimately these systems were phased out in favor of more modern weapons.

But technological advances in the past few years have made the new crop of cruise missiles more reliable than those of the past. Comparatively small and able to fly at very low altitudes, they are hard for the enemy to detect. An improved navigation system, moreover, provides greater accuracy.

These are desirable attributes. But the fundamental requirement of a weapon is that it be able to evade enemy defenses, reach its destination, and then destroy its target. The cruise missile can meet these requirements only against lightly defended areas. Thus, as Secretary of the Air Force Thomas C. Reed has said, cruise missiles cannot fulfill a retaliatory role if the need should arise in the 1980s. That is because all targets of any significance in the Soviet Union, then as now, will be highly defended.

A cruise missile would be unsuccessful in attacking such a target for two main reasons:

—Its speed is comparatively low—less than that of current first-line fighter aircraft, and much less than of prototypes of the B-1.

—It lacks any electronic countermeasure

capability. A cruise missile does not “know,” for example, when enemy radar is tracking it, or when an enemy missile has been fired at it, and so it cannot “know” when or how to take evasive action.

Lessons learned in the Yom Kippur and Vietnam wars prove conclusively that highly defended targets can be attacked successfully only by manned aircraft with speeds nearly 50% greater than those now possible for the cruise. In addition, the aircraft must be able to jam enemy radar and must be equipped with “black boxes” that tell pilots when to take evasive action if a missile is fired at them.

Even with such capabilities, Israel suffered significant aircraft losses during the Yom Kippur war. Yet Egyptian defenses were neither as dense nor as sophisticated as those operative in the Soviet Union, and by the 1980s—the earliest that the cruise missile could be deployed—Soviet defenses are sure to be even more formidable.

To overcome expected Soviet advances, the Defense Department has already initiated research and development on an advanced strategic air-launched missile (ASALM), which combines the features of cruise missiles and rockets. Carried by aircraft like the supersonic B-1 bomber, the ASALM would have a prospective speed six to eight times as great as the cruise missile's. Armed with this high-speed projectile, bombers would be able to fight their way into the Soviet Union and effectively attack highly defended targets.

This is not to say that cruise missiles would never serve a military need. Armed with them, bomber pilots could fly into highly defended areas and launch cruise missiles against lightly defended targets on either side of its flight path.

So the cruise missile does have a potential function, but it is not—and cannot be for a long time to come—the superweapon its supporters claim it to be. It is certainly no substitute for the B-1 bomber.

BILL HUNGATE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to serve with BILL HUNGATE for 12 years. I have known him as a man of honor, of intelligence and of wit. In fact, he is a congenial gentleman. BILL is talented, he composes, sings, and plays the piano with an effect very pleasing to the ear. It is with extreme regret that I see a man of so many talents retire from the House.

Sometimes only we, as his colleagues, have the opportunity to appreciate fully BILL's wit and wisdom. The following letter is an example of the “in-house” humor with which BILL has blessed us in his years here, and I enclose for the RECORD its text for the enjoyment of all:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
September 7, 1976.

DEAR DOC: As my term nears its end—and the days grow short as you reach November—I want to thank all of you, my colleagues, for your courtesy, kindness and most of all, for your understanding.

The House is a fine school. In it we sometimes learn the most from those with whom we disagree.

Let me ask one last favor. Please think of me whenever:

1. A constituent at a statewide rally leans into your face and bets “You don't know my name, do you?” And, you don't!

ii. A colleague speaks one way and votes the other (you might say “the S.O.B. Hungated”).

iii. You write a personal letter frankly expressing your views on some delicate issues such as gun control, abortion, busing and marijuana and you find it has been published in the paper.

iv. The *Democratic Leadership* (*may it be ever thus) has told you that upon completion of a non-controversial bill you may expect to adjourn by 4:00 p.m. Thursday and it's 7:00 p.m. Friday and 15 amendments are at the desk.

v. The news media does a story on your campaign financing and gets all the facts right—you should live so long!

May the future bring all the best for you, your family and friends. And may your mother never find out where you work. As for me, I must now play my piano in another house.

With affectionate regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. HUNGATE.

LONG BEACH AREA ATHLETES PARTICIPATE IN OLYMPICS

HON. MARK W. HANNAFORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. HANNAFORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to laud the accomplishments of 30 young men and women from the Long Beach area in southern California who will be honored by the Long Beach Century Club on September 14, 1976. Deborah A. Ayars; Jack Babashoff; Les Berman, coach; Sherry L. Calvert; Gene Davis; Pat Donnelly; Rayfield Dupree; Lelei A. Fonolmoana; Bruce M. Furniss; Steve C. Furniss; Lisa C. Hansen; Lawrence T. Hart; Annette L. Hilliard; Joni Huntley; Francie Larrieu; Joan L. Lind; Mark E. Lutz; Karen McCloskey; Thomas McKibbin; Anthony J. Montrella, coach; Irene Moreno; Joan K. Schmidt; Claudia Schneider; Albert Schoenfeld, assistant manager; Tim A. Shaw; Dwight E. Stones; Rodney Strachan; John Van Blom; Martha Watson; and Leslie Wolfsberger were members of the 1976 U.S. Olympic team which recently finished competition in Montreal, Canada.

I am sure that all of us in the Congress feel a deep pride in the achievements of the Olympic team at Montreal. But few of us can understand the sacrifice these athletes have made and the painfully hard work they have invested in reaching the Olympics. The Olympic athlete and coach are the personifications of self-discipline, commitment, and competitive excellence, and each of these individuals represents the finest of these ideals.

It is the obligation of the Congress not only to assess the liabilities of our country but to call attention to its assets. Men and women such as these clearly fall into the latter category. It is my privilege, therefore, to enter the names of these individuals into the RECORD of the Congress of the United States and to commend them for their outstanding achievement.

FIREARM VIOLENCE

HON. NORMAN E. D'AMOURS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. D'AMOURS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD an edited article entitled "Handguns, Gun Control Laws and Firearm Violence," published in *Social Problems*.

The article, written by Prof. Douglas R. Murray of the University of Wisconsin, examines the relationship between gun control laws, access to handguns, and the incidence of violence associated with firearms.

The study is notable for its comprehensiveness. It incorporates laws and statistics from all 50 States. It also takes into account sociological factors relating to crime; that is, poverty, race, and education, as well as population and occupational status.

The article is also significant because it focuses on small handguns which, because of their low price and small size, are readily available and easily concealed. These so-called Saturday night specials are also the primary concern of law enforcement groups and the Congress in regards to possible control measures.

Based on the strong statistical evidence in his study, Mr. Murray is led to the ultimate conclusion that—

Gun control laws have no individual or collective effect in reducing the rate of violent crime.

Professor Murray further indicates that possession of a firearm is principally a result of basic social conditions. The high rate of violent crime appears traceable to a much deeper source than the mere availability of weapons. Gun control laws, by inference then, treat only the symptoms of the problem—not the actual causes.

My goal in introducing Mr. Murray's work is to bring the information it contains to the attention of my colleagues and the general public. The Congress has been, and will be, asked for legislation relating to gun control. I feel the topic is of sufficient importance and complexity to warrant the dissemination of as much relevant information as possible. I firmly believe this article is an important addition to the list of materials on gun control that have already been inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I urge my colleagues to read the article and give it careful consideration.

[Reprinted from *Social Problems*. Vol. 23, No. 1, October 1975]

HANDGUNS, GUN CONTROL LAWS AND FIREARM VIOLENCE*

(By Douglas R. Murray, University of Wisconsin)

HISTORY AND LITERATURE OF GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

The main focus of this paper is upon handguns which, because of their low price

* The writer wishes to express his thanks to Howard Erlanger and William Bielby for their useful comments and criticisms on earlier drafts of this paper. This research was supported in part by NCHS Grant TO1HS0091.

and small size, are the weapon of choice for most criminals. It is not surprising that the great bulk of (proposed) legislation concerning firearms centers on pistols of various kinds, particularly the "Saturday night special." Today every state in the country has legislation pertaining to the purchase and possession of such firearms.

But there is little empirical research in this field. Most of the writings are attempts to justify political prejudices whether for or against restrictive handgun legislation. Even the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice makes such statements as the following: "Federal Bureau of Investigation statistics demonstrate that a higher proportion of homicides are committed with firearms in those areas where firearms regulations are lax, than in those areas where there are more stringent controls" (1967:241). The statement is followed by a comparison of Dallas and Phoenix, representing low restriction cities, to Chicago and New York as high restriction cities. This sample of four cities is the only proof provided for the above contention.

Only slightly better is an article by John M. Snyder (1969:55), an editor of the *American Rifleman*, the official publication of the National Rifle Association. He stratified the fifty states into three samples according to the severity of their gun laws and compared the crime rates of the three groups of states. He found that those states with lower rates of gun control had lower rates of homicide in general.

One unpublished study (Newton and Zimring, 1970:182) by the Olin Mathieson Co. concluded from a multiple regression analysis that those states with gun licensing laws do not have significantly lower rates of homicide than those which do. While this research has many limitations, both in scope and methodology, it is better than most. Nevertheless, many people might question any study published by the firearms industry.

Methodologically speaking, the most sophisticated study is that of Geisel, Roll and Wettick (1969). Selecting a sample of the fifty states and all cities over 100,000 population, they constructed an index of major gun laws all combined together and weighted to maximize the variance explained in certain crimes. Using multiple regression, they also included the social factors which are so important. They reported regression coefficients, 95% confidence intervals, probabilities of sign error, and corrected coefficients of determination. Since they concluded that gun control laws do have significant effects, they also provided estimates of how many lives would be saved if the laws were brought up to certain levels of strictness.

The use of this weighting scheme¹ has several disadvantages. One is that it condenses gun control laws into only one variable, limiting the opportunity to explore individual effects by given laws. Another problem is that the weighting is evidently done at the same time as the social variables, possibly diminishing the effect of those social factors which almost certainly play a greater, prior, causal role than do the laws. Thus we are given the entire equation and cannot see the effect of adding the law variables to ascertain whether they actually explain additional variance. To derive the weights, Geisel et al. tried thirty different combinations. It seems quite likely that such random testing could produce weights that are the result of chance correlation with the dependent variables and consequently are probably useful for only this one data set, severely limiting the generalizability of their conclusions. Moreover, the random weighting may pick up variance explained by other social factors not included in the equation.

¹ On weighting schemes for composite variables, see Hauser (1972).

Other problems of interpretation also arise. The use of unstandardized regression coefficients may be useful for translating to "real world" effects, but for the purposes of comparing the relative importance of variables, they are woefully inadequate. The use of the probability of sign error only tells what the chances are of the sign being in a given direction. Even then, only four out of fifteen of the equations produce law variables which are significant at the .05 level. In general, this study seems to have many major shortcomings. For research to be of any real value to the interested observer, it must avoid the more blatant errors which have thus far characterized empirical analysis in this field.

A very recent article by Zimring (1975) attempted to assess the impact of the Gun Control Act of 1968 on rates of handgun homicide and assault. He also explored the efforts of a few cities to limit these crimes through their special programs to control the interstate flow of handguns. In general, Zimring concludes that these laws have had marginal or nonexistent results because gun related crime and handgun ownership have both increased at a very rapid pace, having now become "at least a subnational institution in the big cities" (1975:195). Given the limitations of the available data, he spends the bulk of the article discussing the problems associated with past and current gun control legislation and its implementation.

Studies conducted by Wolfgang (1958) and by Bensing and Schroeder (1960) have suggested that a large number of variables are related to high levels of crime, including poverty, lack of education, low occupational status, high density and overcrowding, substandard rental housing, large numbers of migrants, a high proportion Negro, need for various forms of public assistance, high urbanization and population. While the authors do not substantiate the causal linkages between these social conditions and crime, and it is not the intention of this study to do so here, it is nevertheless widely recognized that there is a strong association.

THE DATA

To begin the empirical analysis, measures of many of the above variables were gathered for the fifty states in 1970 from census and other federal sources and entered into a stepwise multiple regression routine, using a backward, .05 significance level, in-out selection procedure in an attempt to find those social factors which seem to explain the most variance in the rates of reported violence associated with firearms.² The results are most satisfactory in that these variables are able to explain between 66% and 81% of the variance as being associated with primary social conditions.

Since the basic concern is a test of the general hypothesis that the higher the restrictiveness of gun control legislation, the lower the rates of violence, this analysis continues by once again referring to Bakal. He summarized the major laws of all the states concerning handguns (1966:346-352). His method was to ask a series of questions and then provide a short answer.³

² Robbery, aggravated assault, death from accidents caused by firearm missile, suicide by firearm or explosives, and homicide by firearm or explosive. The crimes listed here are those in which firearms are frequently involved. The cause of death data are taken from the vital statistics and consequently, the homicide measure is "cleaner" than the F.B.I. material relating to the same subject.

³ A very similar listing may be found in Newton and Zimring (1970: Appendix G). While the tabulation of such data is necessarily fraught with difficulties, Bakal provides the information in a format that is most amenable to coding into machine readable form.

- (1) Is a license or permit required to purchase a handgun?
- (2) Is a waiting period required between purchase and delivery of handgun?
- (3) Are handgun sales reported to the police?
- (4) Is a license required to sell handguns at retail?
- (5) Is there a minimum age requirement to buy or receive a handgun?
- (6) Is a permit or license required to carry a handgun openly on the person?
- (7) Is a permit or license required to carry a handgun concealed on the person?

GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION AND VIOLENCE

At this point, a clearer specification of the hypothesis is in order. If the primary causes of crime and accidents lie in the harsh social conditions in which people live, what additional effect on the incidence of firearm associated violence is there that may be attributed to the severity of restrictions imposed by differential state legislation on the purchase and possession of handguns?

It is implicit in the arguments of the proponents of such legislation that such laws should play a significant part in lessening crime. To this end, addition of these law variables, separately and collectively, to the social, "causal" model which has already been established should result in a significant (one-tail test at the .05 level of significance) increase in the amount of variance explained and at least one significant standardized regression coefficient.

The results of this regression analysis indicate that, in general, the severity of handgun control laws has no significant effect on the violent crime rates of the fifty states.

To reach this finding, four violent acts⁴ were "predicted" from measures of social conditions contained in the 1970 census. Then, each of the seven gun control laws was added to each of the four "predictor" models to see if they had a significant impact. Out of the resulting twenty-eight equations, not one law had a significant effect on a single measure of violence.

When the seven laws were simultaneously added to the models to test for their collective effect, the total variance explained did not increase significantly. Only in the case of aggravated assault did any of the individual laws within the group prove to be statistically significant. However, this probably is a chance occurrence because while one of the laws (minimum age requirement) was significant, all of the other six law variables in the equation were not able to achieve the specified significance level of $P = .05$ in a one-tailed test. Moreover, even though attempts were made to obtain the best measures possible, the aggravated assault rate is probably the least useful of the five acts of violence associated with firearms because, as the data in Newton and Zimring (1970:39 and 49) indicate, handguns are used in only 18 percent of all aggravated assaults. On the basis of these data, the conclusion is, inevitably, that gun control laws have no individual or collective effect in reducing the rates of violent crime.

At this point, a number of criticisms might be raised which could partially account for the strength and direction of these findings. For example, enforcement of these laws is

⁴ For suicide and homicide, the latest available Vital Statistics material is for 1969; in the interests of comparability, the 1969 data for robbery and assault were also used although the Census material is for 1970. Accidental firearms deaths (1969) were not included in this specific analysis because it was felt that these gun control laws could not logically be expected to have an impact on random, non-criminal occurrences such as accidents.

erratic at best, and the various states have different penalties for violations. There is no way of controlling for such a factor as this which has such complex behavioral, as well as judicial, components.

Another problem is that of interstate traffic. As the President's Commission stated, "Strict controls by one State or city are nullified when a potential criminal can secure a firearm merely by going into a neighborhood jurisdiction with lax controls, or none at all (1967:240)." To the extent that there is a high degree of premeditation involved in the planning of these four violent crimes, this may be a valid criticism.

GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION AND ACCESS TO HANDGUNS

The criticisms raised can be subsumed under the general category of differential access to firearms. The failure of gun laws to control the use of firearms in the commission of violent crimes may be a consequence of the fact that these laws do not effectively limit access. This is an empirical question. What are the social factors related to the possession of handguns and do gun control laws have any significant impact on this phenomenon?

To answer this question, data concerning possession and ownership were gathered from two sources. In October of 1968, Louis Harris and Associates (Erskine, 1972:457) posed the following question to a national, randomly selected sample: "Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers? If yes: Is it a pistol, shotgun or rifle?" The answers were categorized in terms of the percentage of households in the four geographic regions of the country who admitted having one or more shotguns, rifles, pistols, or any guns at all. In May, 1972, a very similar study was conducted by the Gallup Poll (Erskine, 1972: 157). They asked "Do you own a firearm? If yes: How many pistols, rifles, shotguns, muzzleloaders, or other firearms do you own?" The answers were classified in the same manner as the Harris study.

These data, concerning handguns as dependent variables, were entered into a stepwise regression analysis using the same census measures as independent variables as was done to predict rates of violent acts associated with firearms. Generally speaking, the data present no clear picture of the determinants of possession and ownership.

To these basic causal models predicting ownership were added the gun control law variables to see if they had any significant impact on the possession of handguns beyond the associated primary social conditions outlined in the two regression equations. Of the fourteen resulting equations testing the effect of each of the seven laws on handgun possession, two of the laws proved to have a significant impact on accounting for the differential distribution of guns. The two laws, concerning minimum age requirements and a need to obtain a permit to carry the gun openly, each passed the significance test at .043. However, the value of these two equations is open to serious question for a number of reasons. First, the effect is found only on the Harris measure of possession of pistols and not on the Gallup Poll⁵ indicator of possession. Second, the impact disappears when all seven laws are added into the model simultaneously, an important consideration when one remembers that all of these laws are in existence together and are presumably exercising their effect concurrently with one another. A third point is the likelihood, given

⁵ It may also be that the Gun Control Act of 1968 (signed October 22) may have been effective enough in prohibiting purchase of handguns by those under age 18 over enough cohorts so as to make the state minimum age laws superfluous by 1972.

the large number of equations that have been tested, that there may be some "significant" findings that occur strictly by chance. With the .05 level of significance, this would result in approximately five Type II errors in every one hundred tests (given statistical independence).

The conclusion is clear. Gun control laws do not have any apparent effect on a large enough proportion of the population or on those critical elements of the population who are associated with violent acts to effectively limit access to handguns by those who want them. Instead, admitted possession is probably a result of more basic social conditions related to a specific functional need or personal hobby.

ACCESS TO HANDGUNS AND VIOLENCE

At this stage of the analysis, the data have indicated that gun laws have no effect on either handgun ownership or on crime rates, suggesting that this type of legislation is totally irrelevant to its stated purpose. Therefore, a return to the basic theory of firearms control legislation seems in order. As stated, the primary reason for the existence of these laws is to control access to guns so that guns are less likely to be used in acts of violence. Thus far, the relationship between gun laws and crime rates is non-existent. The next and most obvious question now concerns the relationship between access to handguns and acts of violence involving handguns.

On the basis of rather limited studies, Newton and Zimring (1970:78) conclude that this linkage is quite real. They state, "Data from three sources document that the proportion of gun use in violence rises and falls with gun ownership. Statistics from Detroit show that the percentage of gun use in violent attacks parallels rates of gun ownership. A study of guns used in homicides, robberies and assaults in eight major cities shows that cities with a higher proportion of gun use in one crime tend to have a higher proportion of gun use in other crimes." Though using three different data sources, the methodology of these studies is pretty much the same. All tell us there is a very simple zero order correlation between firearm ownership and crime rates. If nothing else, this comparison ignores the importance of fundamental social factors which are the primary basis of human behavior. The question remains, then, whether this relationship continues to exist when we control for these social considerations.

The data from the first two sets of hypotheses were used to establish causal models of violent acts. The two categories of handgun ownership from both surveys were each added to the social predictor variables for each of the five acts for a total of ten models. If differential possession of handguns has any significant effect on the crime rate, then it should appear.

The results are, once again, quite limited. Adding the two measures of handgun ownership obtained from the Harris and Gallup surveys to the social predictor models of violent acts associated with firearms provided a total of ten tests of the effect of differential access to firearms. Out of these, only one, the Gallup indicator of pistol ownership, seemed to have a significant impact on raising the rates of robbery. However, notes of caution must again be sounded.

By using regional data concerning ownership of handguns and applying them to state measures of crime, this has the effect of inflating the size of the standardized regression coefficients and their significance levels beyond what might otherwise be obtained. Moreover, caveats concerning the fact that the same effect was not found for the Harris measure of pistol possession and

the additional chance of Type II errors must be kept in mind.

On the basis of these data,⁶ it seems quite unlikely that the relative availability⁷ of handguns plays a significant part in explaining why some states have higher rates of acts of violence associated with firearms than others.

CONCLUSION

This study has examined three major sets of hypotheses derived from the literature concerning the relationship between handguns, gun control legislation and rates of violence. The study examined data from all fifty states within the very commonly used framework of multiple regression.

In the first set of hypotheses, it was suggested that the various types and severity of gun control laws should have a significant effect on lowering rates of violence associated with firearms. This relationship was not found. The second set of hypotheses concerned the relationship between gun laws and differential rates of possession of handguns throughout the country. Once again, controlling for basic social factors effectively demonstrates the spuriousness of this correlation and the data show that gun laws have no significant effect on access to firearms.

With the third set of hypotheses, the purpose was to determine whether the basic proposition upon which gun laws are based is valid; that is, whether differing rates of access to handguns have any significant effect on violent acts. These hypotheses were also rejected for the same reasons as the foregoing.

This research used nationally collected data readily available and ordinary multiple regression techniques of statistical analysis. Considering the importance placed by many observers on gun control legislation, it is all that much more interesting that all of the equations did not result in more significant effects attributable to the critical variables. These findings are a direct contradiction of the widely-held opinion concerning the relationship of firearms, gun control laws, and crime rates; although, of course, more research is needed in this area.

Former Attorney General Ramsey Clark (1970:101) has cited estimates that there may be as many as 200 million guns among the civilian population of this country. Any attempt to exercise any form of control over them would be an extremely difficult undertaking. Even relatively low level legislation,

⁶ While one may rightfully criticize the accuracy of the information derived from either of the two surveys concerning ownership and possession of firearms, these two independent bodies of data do substantiate each other as regards the general conclusions of this paper. This occurs in spite of the fact that the statistical properties of regional measures applied to state data would tend to act against the findings that were actually obtained.

⁷ This conclusion is supported by Wolfgang (1958:81-82) who stated, "Several students of homicide have tried to show that the high number of, or easy access to, firearms in this country is causally related to our relatively high homicide rate. Such a conclusion cannot be drawn from the Philadelphia data. . . . [I]t does not necessarily follow that the relatively high homicide rate in this country is merely due to greater accessibility of such weapons." Nevertheless, Wolfgang remains a very strong proponent of the strictest of gun legislation, writing in a letter to Time magazine (July 5, 1968:6), "I have consistently favored the most restrictive legislation the Government can obtain from Congress." He suggested that the government confiscate virtually all firearms in this country with compensation at current market value.

as registration, would cost several hundred million dollars, at a minimum. Confiscation and purchase, at an average of \$50 each, for example, would mean an investment of possibly \$10 billion! Any such legislation would be seriously resisted by both criminal elements and those with strong moral objections to the laws. Even a one percent non-cooperation rate, low as that is, would still mean 2,000,000 guns (especially pistols) unregistered and hundreds of thousands of normally law-abiding individuals suddenly labelled as criminals. If the law cannot control such highly visible criminal activities as drug trafficking, gambling, and prostitution, with their continuing sales of commodities and services to the general public, then it seems unlikely that it could control the one-time sale of an item that can last for generations. The basic question is, then, are we willing to make sociological and economic investments of such a tremendous nature in a social experiment for which there is no empirical support?

CAPTAIN OF POLICE ALBIN HEGGE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, when a policeman reaches his time for retirement, it is always a special occasion. It means that a person who has devoted his life toward serving and protecting society can now relax and enjoy life—and, at the same time there is a note of sadness, as there is whenever men and women who have worked together must bid farewell to one of their own.

Thus, it was on June 25 of this year, when Capt. Albin Hegge of the Los Angeles Police Department retired after more than 29 years of duty. Captain Hegge was commanding officer of the Harbor Area Support Division at the time he stepped down, and the men and women he worked with, along with a grateful community, will miss him greatly.

Born on October 30, 1922, in Sherman, S. Dak., Albin Hegge served in the U.S. Air Force during World War II as a first lieutenant. After coming to the Los Angeles area, he entered the Los Angeles Police Department on March 16, 1947.

On January 9, 1957, when he was appointed sergeant of police, Albin Hegge began his rise through the ranks. He became a lieutenant on the force on May 1, 1965, and was appointed captain of police on January 6, 1974.

In his long and successful career with the department, Captain Hegge—or Al, as he was known to his many friends—served in many areas of Los Angeles before coming to our own Harbor Area. He also held several commands, including the Venice Detective Division, Central Support Division, and the Harbor Support Division.

Captain Hegge holds a bachelor of science degree in police science from the California State University at Los Angeles, and a master of science degree in public administration from the University of Southern California. With his

lovely wife, Bonnie, he has been a resident of Lomita for the past 20 years.

The Los Angeles Police Department is known as one of the best—if not the best—police departments in the Nation. The reputation of the members of the Los Angeles Police Department for honesty, efficiency, and good community relations has been well earned. Capt. Albin Hegge, throughout his many years with the department, has been the epitome of this spirit, bringing with his outstanding qualifications, a true understanding for his job.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Albin Hegge on his retirement after an outstanding career of service to the people of our community. I understand that Captain Hegge and his wife are taking an extended Bicentennial tour of the United States, and we hope his vacation will be a safe and enjoyable one. We know that his wife and their two children, Barbara and Ronald, must all be understandably proud of Albin Hegge's outstanding career and many contributions to the Los Angeles area.

WHEELCHAIR OLYMPICS— OCTOBER 2, 1976

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on October 2, 1976, more than 125 disabled athletes from Northeastern and Mid-Atlantic States will participate in the Second Annual Invitational Wheelchair Athletic Meet at the Burke Rehabilitation Center in White Plains, N.Y. This event is sponsored by the center in conjunction with the Tri-State Wheelchair Athletic Association and the Westchester County Office for the Handicapped.

The forthcoming competition should prove to be exciting for men and women of all ages who will compete in such events as the dash, relay, and slalom racing; javelin, discus, shotput, archery, table tennis, and weight lifting.

Burke Foundation, a longtime leader in innovative ways to aid the handicapped and physically disabled in all facets of their rehabilitative needs, is a 150-bed facility which has provided excellent services to the Westchester County population for a number of years. Within the past few years, a Day Hospital was begun under a grant from the Federal Government. This program helps a number of people on an outpatient basis receive the therapy they would otherwise not be able to get at home and provides a good opportunity to socialize with others who face the same obstacles. The response to this program was so great that the Day Hospital has now been incorporated into the center's annual budgetary needs as a permanent part of the center's activities.

I am privileged to be a guest at the meet and would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the participants as well as the Burke staff members who have given so much of their time to make this event possible.

HEALTH CARE

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, "cost" is a discouraging word in the health care field and in the debate over national health insurance. As I have pointed out before, until we address this issue, substantial progress toward the goal of quality health care at a price that people can afford is unlikely.

Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, in an article published in the September issue of *Human Behavior*, explores yet another facet of the health care cost problem—the drain on the Federal budget caused by tax expenditures granted to a select portion of the population to cover their health care expenses. As Mr. KENNEDY points out, this money does not go toward the population hardest hit by the health care cost rise—the poor and the elderly living on fixed incomes.

I commend the article to my colleagues and trust that they, too, will take a closer look at the real health care costs, and the disposition of our limited economic resources in this area:

THE IRS HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM, REVIEWED BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY

We already have a National Health Insurance Program and it's being run by the Internal Revenue Service.

One of the most cockeyed aspects of the current debate over national health insurance is the fact that the United States already has an NHI program. It's a \$6 billion program now, and the cost will reach \$10 billion five years down the road. This multimillion dollar program provides federal financial assistance for private health bills. It's not run by HEW, which carries out most federal health programs. It's not run by the Social Security Administration, which carries out Medicare. It's run by the Internal Revenue Service.

Yes, the IRS is running a national health insurance program in the United States, and it has been doing so for many years. The program is well-known to many taxpayers, because it is carried out through the tax laws. It consists of the deductions allowed for health insurance premiums and medical expenses.

So far, so good. But the actual effect of the program doesn't bear analysis. The IRS is running the kind of program that only the Mad Hatter and March Hare would understand. Four key aspects tell the story:

To qualify for the IRS program at all, you must owe some federal income tax. Otherwise, your health deduction can't be used. So, most low-income families and the working poor get no benefit at all from the IRS health insurance program, because they pay little or no taxes.

Even among persons who pay taxes, the only ones who can take advantage of the IRS health insurance program are those who itemize deductions. If you take the so-called standard deduction, you're out of luck. In 1974, only 36 percent of the taxpayers itemized their return; 64 percent took the standard deduction. In general, persons who itemize are usually those who are making mortgage interest payments, since the interest on the mortgage is large enough to make it advantageous for the taxpayer to forgo the standard deduction and itemize his or her deductions. So, the tax code has a national health insurance program, but it's mainly for homeowners, not renters.

Next, the IRS, like many private health insurance policies, has a "deductible" in its insurance program. Health expenses may be deducted only to the extent they exceed 3 percent of income. That eliminates most taxpayers, even if they are homeowners.

Worst of all, the IRS program also has a "coinsurance" feature. Again, many private policies do the same. Only this coinsurance is upside-down: the richer you are, the larger the share of your health bill the government agrees to pay. For those in the lowest tax bracket, after the three percent deduction is met, the government pays only 14 percent of the eligible health bill, and the taxpayer pays the other 86 percent. But for the wealthiest taxpayers in the highest bracket, the government pays 70 percent of the bill, and the patient pays only 30 percent.

The net result is an IRS health insurance program skewed in favor of wealthy homeowners, with everyone else left out or short-changed. Such "red-haired, one-eyed man-with-a-limp" requirements permeate the tax laws, but they are especially offensive in a field like health, which ought to be a basic right for every citizen, not just an expensive privilege for the few.

The health deduction is one of over 80 federal subsidies called "tax expenditures," in recognition of the fact that the government spends money through foregone taxes as well as through the regular appropriations process. Other well-known tax expenditures include accelerated depreciation, the favorable low tax rates on capital gains, the tax exemption allowed for interest on municipal bonds and the investment credit for equipment and machinery. The most notorious tax expenditure was probably the 27.5 percent depletion allowance for oil, which gave away billions of dollars a year in lower taxes to the nation's largest oil companies, until it was finally repealed by Congress in 1975.

The amount of revenues lost because of such tax subsidies is large. Next year, it is estimated that tax expenditures will cost the Treasury over \$105 billion, or more than the entire federal budget for defense. In fact, tax expenditures have been climbing even more rapidly than other federal expenditures, rising by 105 percent since 1971, compared with a rise of 96 percent in the traditional federal budget. Curiously, those who object the loudest to other federal spending rarely make a peep when tax spending is the issue.

To some extent, of course, no one is really at fault for the present system. The tax laws have grown like Topsy, without nearly enough analysis of the economic and social consequences.

Not all tax expenditures are bad. Some are efficient incentives for capital investment and for important social goals. But others are simply windfalls for the wealthy, wasting vast amounts of scarce federal dollars. The job of tax reform is to weed out this waste. At a time when Congress and the administration are putting basic federal spending programs under the microscope in such areas as jobs, housing, education and national defense, they can hardly do less for the massive spending that takes place through the tax laws.

Starting from scratch, no one would create a national health insurance program with such absurdities as the health deduction. Yet that is the form of national health insurance the Internal Revenue Service is carrying out.

The tax reform program I have been urging in Congress, however, does not touch the health deduction. That reform will have to wait until a genuine national health insurance program is set in place, with a more rational way of helping taxpayers pay their hospital and doctor bills and health insurance premiums. Until then the deduction will in all likelihood sit there unchanged in the Internal Revenue Code, a silent symbol of the foolish way we use our tax laws to pay for health.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
GUN CONTROL

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Post on Thursday morning, September 2, a story regarding the effect of legislation which Congress passed last week to block the District of Columbia City Council's new gun control regulations. The story relates that the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress has prepared a legal opinion to the effect that the new regulations "should be considered valid" despite the passage of H.R. 12261 with an amendment which I sponsored.

The Post's story completely misinterprets the Library of Congress opinion, and I would like to take this opportunity to describe for my colleagues what that opinion really says.

In addition, since there seems to be some question about how the amendment which I offered to H.R. 12261 should be understood, I would like to comment on that as well.

First, the CRS opinion clearly states that the District of Columbia City Council had no authority to enact its new gun control regulations in the first place.

My distinguished colleague from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) inserted into the RECORD of August 26 the text of the CRS opinion dated August 8, 1976 on this very point. It says:

The conclusion of this report is that the (District of Columbia Firearms Control Regulations) Act is not valid.

A subsequent opinion prepared by the CRS, dated August 31, goes on to examine the effect of H.R. 12261, with an important qualification which the Post ignored. Namely, it is based on an assumption that the Council's action was within its legislative authority—a purely hypothetical assumption which CRS already had rejected, but posed for the sake of argument.

The Post does a disservice to the public when it fails to report that the regulation would be invalid even without passage of H.R. 12261, as the opinion plainly points out.

The purpose of my amendment incorporating into the Home Rule Act language specifically addressing firearms laws was intended to clarify and reaffirm, not add to, the prohibition on City Council legislation on this subject. That was necessary because the Council was attempting to circumvent this restriction through a flimsy assertion that it was not enacting laws, just "changing regulations." H.R. 12261 is intended to nip this foolishness in the bud without having to go to court just to keep the Council from abusing its authority.

With respect to whether my amendment to H.R. 12261, the pending D.C. gun regulations, I am quite surprised that the CRS study of the floor debate on Monday, August 23, misses completely the basic thrust of my statement, which was highly critical of the pending regulations. It also misconstrues several com-

ments which I made in the course of answering questions.

At no time did I say that my amendment would not affect the pending gun regulations. Indeed, that was the entire point of my amendment. What I did say was that my amendment would not affect the gun control regulations which already are in effect in the District of Columbia.

These regulations have been in effect for the last 8 years, and are not the same ones pending in the Congress.

The CRS thinks my response to the question from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) suggests otherwise. What I said was:

I would answer by saying that the proposal of the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the committee, does not in any way take away the right of the Council, except upon the passage of this act, to amend the criminal code, so that anything previous to the amendment to the act today would be in effect, if they put it in effect.

That simply meant that H.R. 12261, which was introduced by my colleague from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) whose bill I was supporting, would not detract from the Council's authority to amend the criminal code after the period reserved exclusively to Congress expired in January 1979, and that any regulations which the Council, acting properly within its authority, had previously put into effect, would remain in effect.

My statement referred to the present regulations passed in 1968, and could not have referred to the ones now pending, since these have not yet been put in effect.

I am puzzled how the CRS or anyone else could think I was suggesting that the Council could amend the criminal code prior to passage of H.R. 12261. If there is anything on which everyone—on both sides of this issue—agrees, it is that the Council has been forbidden to amend the criminal code since January 2, 1975.

I elaborated further on this point in response to a question from my colleague from Illinois (Mr. McCLOY). The Library of Congress paper seems to have ignored that statement entirely.

I said:

At no time did I limit or make a direct statement that would lead any Member to believe my amendment to the Diggs amendment would change any part of the criminal code that was on the books prior to the passage of the original legislation by Congress which is being amended today.

The only statement made anywhere in the debate that the bill would not block the new pending regulations was made by Mr. DIGGS, in opposition to my amendment. With all due respect to my distinguished colleague, it hardly seems appropriate to interpret the intent of my amendment according to how it is described by one speaking against it.

I also take exception to another seemingly artificial qualification in the CRS legal opinion, which says that H.R. 12261, when "read alone *** contains no language justifying application of its provisions to legislation such as the Firearms Act which was enacted prior to its passage."

It would be a strange rule of statutory construction indeed that required an amendment to be "read alone" to interpret its meaning. All of the language of H.R. 12261 consists of amendments to section 602(a)(9) of the D.C. Home Rule Act, and none of added words are even complete sentences.

The only sensible way to interpret H.R. 12261 is to read it together with the provision of law it amends. When read in this context, it obviously was not necessary for H.R. 12261 to contain any specific provision for retroactive coverage. Such an effect is already "built in."

Existing law forbids the Council from amending the code for 24 months beginning on January 2, 1975. Unless that starting date were also amended—and it was not—any clarification or modification of that section likewise relates to the 24 months following January 2, 1975.

I hope that my colleagues will take the time to review this matter and satisfy themselves that the action taken August 23 accomplishes what I intended.

MANNED BALLOONS FOR AIR QUALITY MONITORING

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress a most interesting and innovative project currently being conducted by the Aerospace Corp. in my congressional district.

The program, known as the ATMOSAT project, involves the use of manned, superpressure balloons for scientific air-quality monitoring.

The project has already conducted three manned flights of almost 100 hours total duration in the balloon ATMOSAT America. The first flight was launched on February 18, 1976, from Rancho Palos Verdes, a suburb of Los Angeles, and after a flight slightly in excess of 30-hours duration, landed at Lukeville, Ariz.

The second flight was launched from San Angelo, Tex., on April 18, 1976, and landed near Goodland, Kan., and the third flight on July 2, 1976, flew from Rancho Palos Verdes in California to Death Valley.

Thomas F. Heinsheimer, director of the ATMOSAT project, has asked me to indicate the project's readiness to assist local, State, and Federal air pollution control programs through use of this new and important monitoring platform.

I also wish to insert in the RECORD at this point a brief description of the ATMOSAT program which was provided by the Aerospace Corp.:

THE SCIENTIFIC MISSION OF "AMERICA"

The ATMOSAT "America" follows in the nearly 200-year tradition of scientific application of manned balloons. The flights of such manned balloons provide a unique opportunity to precisely measure the composition and

motion of the atmosphere around them. "America" will carry special instruments to perform these measurements.

As a "traveling weather tower," "America" will concentrate on pollution and meteorological studies. Instruments will be mounted at various levels along the "tower" to measure air temperature and turbulence. This will permit analyzing the fine structure of a layer of the atmosphere, which can be measured only by a vehicle moving freely in that layer of air.

"America's" helium gas temperature will be monitored to detect changes in heat radiation—infrared rays streaming upward from the earth. As it flies over cities, deserts, forests, lakes, and mountains, at altitudes ranging from 1,000 to 14,000 feet, this radiation will vary—and its effects will be recorded on board.

The experiment is the forerunner of an ambitious infrared radiation monitoring experiment planned for later in the decade. That experiment would use larger 30-meter unmanned ATMOSATs flying in the stratosphere (60,000-foot altitude) to analyze the heat balance between the Earth, lower atmosphere, and stratosphere itself.

TEST PROGRAM

Before the production of these larger ATMOSATs, carrying one-ton payloads into the stratosphere, a test program using less ambitious 10-meter (33 feet) models is being undertaken. In the past, a new balloon design was qualified by flying some 10 to 20 prototypes at the mission altitude, and each was equipped with a simple high frequency telemetry transmitter sending data back to ground stations. These balloons fly until they lose life and then fall into the sea; no recovery is attempted. Over the past 10 years considerable experience has been gained on the in-flight testing of Mylar superpressure balloons, and this experience forms the basis of the current ATMOSAT test.

"America," the first production 10-meter ATMOSAT balloon, however, will be used for extensive ground and low altitude testing before it is committed to a non-recoverable test flight. The most important aspect of this test is to thoroughly understand the thermodynamics of the balloon in all possible flight situations. This will assure that ATMOSAT never falls due to highly negative supertemperature of the helium, and that the scientific payload weight is not reduced because the balloon design is heavier than it should be.

"America" is constructed with a new high-strength material (Kevlar) which has made the design of heavy payload long-lived balloons a realistic goal. The possibility of supporting a one-ton payload at 60,000 feet is well within the strength limitations of a balloon having this material as its primary structural element. It is this potential that gave rise to the ATMOSAT program.

The balloon is made of a "sandwich" of materials:

An inner layer of Kevlar cloth to sustain the pressure loads.

A layer of bilaminated Mylar to contain the helium.

An outer sheet of aluminized Mylar to limit variations of helium temperature, and to protect the inner Kevlar layer from ultraviolet radiation.

MEASUREMENTS

During the three low level flights over various terrain, careful track was made of cloud cover above and below, solar elevation in daytime, air temperature, velocity of the balloon with respect to the air, etc. The thermal response of the balloon to its environment was noted by measuring helium gas temperature and ten skin temperatures of the balloon at regular intervals during the flight.

A typical set of measurements, to be repeated each 30 minutes, include:

- Balloon location
- Balloon altitude (and rate of climb, if any)
- Balloon superpressure
- Ambient temperature
- Each skin and gas temperature sensor
- Photos of surrounding clouds and ground
- Comments of observer.

This data is subsequently analyzed, and the result will be an accurate prediction of the thermal situation to be faced by an operational ATMOSAT in the stratosphere, as well as a prediction of the load carrying capacity, altitude range, and lifetime of the subsequent stratospheric flights.

LATER FLIGHTS

In later manned flights of "America," pollution-monitoring will be stressed. A recent breakthrough in the technology of ozone detectors has produced an ozone sensor ideal for flight aboard a manned balloon. This device, an ultraviolet photometer, will permit the precise measurement of ozone concentration some two-three times per minute during the flight. This data, combined with "America's" position and altitude profile, will allow mapping of ozone along the flight path. As ozone is a particularly important pollutant, this data will be of special interest.

Work is also under way to provide instruments for the on-board measurement of oxides of carbon, nitrogen (the famous NOx), and sulphur. "Particulate traps"—small flasks containing special filters—also will be carried. At intervals during the flight, each flask will be unsealed and ambient air will be drawn through the filter, which will capture the microscopic contaminants. The exact location and altitude of the balloon will be noted in each case. The flasks and all other data will then be returned to the laboratories of The Aerospace Corporation and the Southern California Air Pollution Control District (APCD) for analysis. This will allow comparison of pollutants measured at altitude with those recorded at the same time by APCD instruments on the ground.

GONDOLA EQUIPMENT

To perform the low altitude flights, the gondola is equipped with a number of flight systems:

- 1) Flight Control System
 - a) Aircraft 720 channel communications transceiver
 - b) OMNI position receiver
 - c) Aircraft radar transponder
 - d) Pressure altimeter and rate-of-climb indicator
- 2) Balloon Technology System
 - a) Balloon superpressure gauge and audible pressure alarms.
 - b) Helium valve control unit
 - c) Thermistor array and readout monitor
 - d) Cameras, log books, data sheets and procedures
- 3) Power System—Four independent sources of 14-volt and 28-volt power to energize all systems using high capacity lithium batteries.

GOALS

In summary, the low altitude flights of the 10-meter ATMOSAT will then have these goals:

- 1) Collection of the necessary thermal data for design of the 30-meter stratospheric ATMOSAT
- 2) Accumulation of technical data on launch, flight, and recovery techniques of the new type of vehicle.
- 3) Scientific observations of the environment using instruments provided by interested laboratories or agencies.

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES CAN- NOT IGNORE THE NORTHERN IRE- LAND CRISIS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as the Presidential campaign intensifies, the American voters will have a better opportunity to learn the respective candidates' views on important issues. Certainly in the area of foreign affairs a very vital issue is the future of Northern Ireland. For years, myself and other Members of Congress have sought to make this Nation take a more affirmative role in the struggle for peace and justice in Ireland. Our involvement to this point has been more negative than positive, and consequently, there is no peace today in Ireland.

Dr. Fred Burns O'Brien, Information Director for the Irish National Caucus, a leading Irish-American organization has prepared a position paper on Ireland. One of its main themes I vigorously support, namely allowing the right of self-determination to be given to the people of Ireland. This is a cause which should be championed by both candidates for President and the next Congress should also make as one of its early priorities, full hearings into the Irish question. I offer Dr. O'Brien's statement for the consideration of my colleagues:

[Prepared for the Honorable Jimmy Carter]

STATEMENT ON IRELAND

The foreign policy of the United States has in recent history been unresponsive to nations and peoples seeking national self-determination in identical perspective to that which the U.S. itself took by force of arms two-hundred years ago. You, Governor Carter, have stated you wish to return U.S. Foreign Policy to that status of respect in the world community, that America the leader of the free world, should be accorded. We in the Irish National Caucus agree with your assessment that foreign policy should not be the domain of one man, but responsive to, and with input from, the American people.

In our Bicentennial year, freedom, self-determination and national sovereignty are by-words of particular significance to Americans, and we would wish for their ideals to be accepted by other nations and would hope that those still harboring colonial states would concede to withdrawing in good faith from overseeing sovereign peoples as a humanitarian gesture.

In particular, recognizing the role of Irish-Americans in the American Revolution and throughout our history, we in America would wish for freedom and democracy for the Irish homeland now involved in a struggle for national self-determination. We would desire for our ally, Britain, to recognize the need for an orderly phased withdrawal from Ireland. This is of deep concern to the United States, because any war, revolution or insurrection engaged in by a NATO power directly affects the defense posture of Western Europe and the U.S., and in fact weakens that defense effort. We have witnessed turmoil in Cyprus as well as Ireland.

NATO cannot afford to be weak, but the conflict in Northern Ireland the past six

years has weakened the organization. We encourage the British Government to declare its intention to withdraw from Northern Ireland so they and the Irish can work to be constructive neighbors, enabling the two islands to complement one another's growth creating economic stabilization for both peoples.

The renowned British historian, A.J.P. Taylor, in an interview over Irish radio has called for such a withdrawal as the road to a cessation of longrange violence. Mr. Taylor's credentials, to observe and evaluate history, are impeccable and his reasoning to that effect should be heeded by the British. Britain's efforts in Northern Ireland are inconsistent with its role as a democracy. The stature of British democracy and its international reputation can only be enhanced by a humanitarian withdrawal from Ireland, and by providing economic assistance to an Ireland determined by the entire population of the island.

In this view, the United States would consider quite favorably offering economic aid to a peaceful Ireland ruled by the Irish people, an Ireland which would cherish culture, tradition, and heritage of all its peoples regardless of religion.

We encourage Britain to help both Ireland and Britain by departing Ireland as it has done in other colonized areas. The greatness of Britain can be shown by assisting the Irish people not by maintaining jurisdiction over them. Britain has tried many solutions, perhaps with the best of good intentions, but their failure can be overcome by permitting an Irish solution with no British veto. A new Irish nation constructed by the Irish people as a neutral or NATO ally, is to the benefit of both Britain and the United States.

U.S. PEACE ROLE

The query: Should the United States become involved in Northern Ireland, is inoperative. There has been both direct and indirect aid, and a combination of both to Britain. British troops have been trained, weapons of varying degrees supplied, American replacements for NATO troops dispatched to free British soldiers for duty in Ireland. British agents allowed to investigate Irish-American activity, F.B.I. harassment of Irish-Americans, revocation of the visas of the Republican Movement, and a chilling effect on legal political activities by illegal activities of U.S. law enforcement agencies. And now direct assistance to British authorities by sending U.S. agents to the North to help the British (a belligerent) to the detriment of Irish-Americans. It has gone too far.

The U.S. approach has been a severe blow to the credibility of American predominance as a free democracy, since policy has been to sustain the incursion of an aggressor nation. The Irish-American community would toil to terminate this innate proliferation of disaster, and re-establish the American conscience for the underdog, the oppressed, and those in rightful rebellion. We seek, therefore, to influence foreign policy to a sensible, rational, and truly neutral approach.

The Irish National Caucus enmeshed itself in Presidential politics in the key primary states of Massachusetts, New York and others. At the time of the first two primaries above, Senator Henry Jackson had given the strongest support to the Irish voters. The Senator condemned the treatment accorded the remains of martyr Frank Stagg and above all called for a declaration of intent for the British to withdraw from Ireland.

It is the policy of the Irish National Caucus to present statements and position papers to the endorsing organization, (i.e. the

Ancient Order of Hibernians), of the Irish community and allow their evaluation. The voter will judge on the basis of the strength of the candidate's statement.

The Caucus will maneuver after the National Conventions to seek position papers from Congressional and Senatorial candidates seeking response to interrogatories of Irish constituents. The Irish vote in 1976 will not be taken for granted by any candidate with no exceptions.

The United States government cannot afford to ignore the effects of the Irish American community acting on behalf of the Irish nation and the Irish people. The good offices of the United States must be placed in availability to the Irish people for a role in mediation of the Anglo-Irish dispute. The United States is quite suited for a role as mediator. The U.S. has a special relationship with Britain, Ireland and the Republican Movement. The latter element has modeled its efforts for self-determination after that of the United States and it holds the sympathy in varying degrees from the majority of the millions of Irish Americans.

We request that your Administration:

- (1) Support a declaration of intent by the British to withdraw from Ireland.
- (2) Recognize the right of self-determination of all the Irish people.
- (3) Termination of F.B.I. harassment of Irish Americans.
- (4) Support for Full Congressional Hearings on Ireland.
- (5) Restoration of visas to Irish Citizens of all political persuasions.

PATRIOTS' DREAMS

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, an inspiring sermon was delivered on July 4, 1976, by a resident of my congressional district, Rev. Donald C. Landis. The sermon, preached at the First Presbyterian Church of Glenolden, impressed a visiting government official, who suggested that I share it with our colleagues.

The sermon eloquently reviews some of the basic principals upon which our government has been founded. I agree that it merits the attention of all Members of Congress in this Bicentennial Year:

PATRIOTS' DREAM

(Sermon delivered by Rev. Donald C. Landis, First Presbyterian Church of Glenolden, Glenolden, Pa.)

America, the melting pot of nations, has from the beginning welcomed foreigners to its shores. America, the beautiful, as sung the glory of amber waves of grain and purple mountain majesties. America, the land of the free and the home of the brave, has led the world of the 20th century in science and technology. Writers, politicians, and philosophers have wrestled with the question of what holds this restless, striving, diverse population together in one nation. America is more than the sum total of various ethnic groups. America is more than resplendent geography. America is more than technology and productivity. Over two hundred years ago thirteen colonies gave birth to a new idea that was stated in the Declaration of Independence. That idea was the flintstone of democracy setting ablaze the torch of liberty. That idea, that commitment has kept

this nation together through financial crises, civil war, and militaristic attack.

Governments, so states the Declaration, derive their "just powers from the consent of the governed." Now you might easily miss that phrase by a quick reading of the Declaration. But it's there, and it is equal to only one other thought in the Declaration—namely, that governments are instituted to secure the inalienable rights given all men by virtue of creation, which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The reason this idea was of such revolutionary importance was that it was totally new. Formerly, kings and monarchs had governed by the theory of the Divine Right of Kings. The Divine Right of Kings as it was called in the golden days of monarchy was simply that kings and monarchs ruled by virtue of the providence and will of God, and therefore, to oppose the king was to oppose God. Obviously, with politics and religion so joined it was impossible to criticize the government without at the same time judging God, which was an intolerable thought. For the first time in human history, the Declaration gave a new rationale to human government; the just powers of government derive their legitimacy, not from God, but from the just consent of the governed.

Now, it was not that the drafters of the Declaration were specifically anticlerical, anti-God, or anti-church. They were simply faced with the dilemma of correcting the abuses of monarchy and of tyranny that had taken place under the system of government called "the Divine Right of Kings." Thus, governments were responsible, not to God, but under the reasoning of the Declaration, to the populace whose rights they secured.

On this two hundredth anniversary of our nation's birth, let us examine once again the Patriots' Dreams.

A. The patriots who founded this nation dreamed of a rule of law in contrast to the capricious rule of man, so well illustrated in the temperamental regulations of a King George III. The abuses of power that are always present under a system where there is a rule of man were still fresh in the minds of our colonialists forefathers. Even when avowed Christians possessed and exercised the right of high office, Christian principles became sub-ordinated to the lust for power and greed. "Christian monarchs" such as Philip II of Spain, Mary of England, Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, William the Silent of the Netherlands, and Oliver Cromwell of England exemplified the pagan prince more than the emissary of Christ. Fresh in the minds of our forefathers were the devastations of the Thirty Years War (1618-1648) in which Protestants and Roman Catholics tried to annihilate each other.

Noteworthy in this era are the efforts of King Louis XIV of France who sought to suppress the protestant minority called Huguenots. The struggle to live peaceably under a monarch who was at the same time Chief Magistrate and Defender of the Faith had failed to protect the rights and privileges, civil and religious, that Protestants in the Colonies had come to demand as a God-given right.

Therefore, our Colonial forefathers wrote into the Declaration a kernel of truth that was a new rationale for government, not based upon Divine Right of Monarchs, but based upon the idea that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. That ovum of truth gave birth to the Democratic Experiment expressed so well by a later advocate as "Government of the people, by the people, for the people."

Statesman Adlai Stevenson once said:

"When an American says he loves his country, he means not only that he loves the

New England hills, the prairies glistening in the sun, or the wide rising plains, the mountains, and the seas. He means that he loves an inner air, an inner light in which freedom lives and in which a man can draw the breath of self-respect."

B. Secondly, Patriots dreamed of a nation in which criticism was not equal to treason. It was the prophetic office in the Old Testament that offered both counsel and criticism many times to a stubborn and willful king. No one else in all Israel would have dared to accuse King David of his sin with Bathsheba and expect to live but the Lord's prophet, Nathan. For David refused to raise his hand against the Lord's anointed servant and repented of his sin (Psalm 51). Yet, other prophets did not fare so well when they criticized the King. Remember the sufferings of the prophet Jeremiah for having spoken God's word to the king. He was accused of treason, and treated as a traitor to Israel.

The patriots who dreamed of this nation thought of a land where even the lowliest subject could disagree with or even criticize the highest office without fear of retaliation or recrimination. The black spot of Watergate upon the political history of this nation has at least proved that the highest office in the nation can be held responsible to the people. The one principle that underlines democracy and makes it a viable system of government is the freedom to speak out on any issue, to address one's fellow citizens on any matter that one deems important. Such a system provides for correction when power is abused, provides redress of grievances for its citizens, provides a platform where ideas can be weighed in the balance of public opinion.

If it ever becomes a crime in this nation to speak publicly on the issue of the day; if one must fear to use his own telephone because of the possibility that it is being tapped; if anyone is silenced in this nation by fear of threat or retaliation—then Patriots' Dreams will be only forgotten memories.

C. Finally, those early Patriots dreamed of a nation where men would honor their heroes and their traditions by a responsible use of power and freedom. Lincoln said in his Gettysburg Address at the dedication of the National Cemetery at Gettysburg, Penna. in 1863 "... In a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground." He went on to conclude that, "It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us..."

The noblest honor and the highest tribute that we can pay to those honored patriots who have gone before us is to use responsibly and well the freedom and power that they and Divine providence has placed in our hands. Flags, flowers, and trumpets are poor substitutes for consecrated devotion to the nation's ideals.

We can bring to realization the dreams of patriots by a faithful stewardship of the nation's most valuable possession—not the gold of Fort Knox, not the technology so evident in the night of our arms, not the power of mass production—but the faith, the trust, the vision of its people.

If we weaken that faith, diminish that trust, blur that vision by the misuse of power or of freedom we will have poorly served the cause for which so many patriots have died. Let this Bicentennial Celebration be more than the biggest bash ever thrown. If we are untrue to the dreams of Colonial Patriots, it will not matter how many covered wagons circle around at Valley Forge, it will not matter how big and breath-taking our fireworks, or how many masted ships catch the

wind on the Hudson River. When the party is over—what will become of the dreams, the visions Patriots held long ago for this "new order of the ages."

That is the question we must ask ourselves this morning! Will the rule of law prevail over the rule of man? Will public criticism ever become treasonous in the land of the free and the home of the brave? Will we, the heirs of freedom, be able to pass on the torch of liberty to the next generation undimmed by personal abuse? Will we keep faith with Patriots' Dreams "so that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth?"

The signers of the Declaration placed their reliance upon the protection of Divine Providence, and pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor in the cause of freedom. Dare we, the living, do less?

VOLUNTARY SCHOOL INTEGRATION PLAN WORKING IN MILWAUKEE

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the city of Milwaukee developed a desegregation plan which is, in my opinion, of far-reaching and vital significance to cities across our country. As one of the recent major cities involved in school segregation, the citizens of Milwaukee, business and civic interests, parents and the entire community, have effectively cooperated in planning, developing and implementing a peaceful and voluntary integration plan.

Mr. Speaker, in January the Federal Court stipulated that one-third or 53 of the public schools in Milwaukee had to be integrated. That figure has just been met, and even exceeded, with 58 voluntarily integrated schools starting this fall.

The problem of school segregation is not unique to the city of Milwaukee. Many cities across the country have been ordered to desegregate their schools. What is unique is that Milwaukee's approach was to develop a viable plan using voluntary incentives and no forced busing. And that plan is working.

Under the fine leadership of its superintendent, Dr. Lee R. McMurrin, the Milwaukee School Board developed a responsible plan which fulfills the objectives of offering an equal educational opportunity to all students while demonstrating sincere and careful planning, community-wide input, and a sensitivity to the uniqueness of the Milwaukee community.

The Milwaukee plan is characterized by several important features: first of all, it is voluntary—it does not resort to forced busing; second, it is viable—it complies with the Federal court order to eliminate de jure segregation; third, it has strong support from the Milwaukee school officials, public representatives, civic and business leaders, labor leaders, parents and teachers, who all have a sincere desire and a genuine willingness to make this plan work.

Mr. Speaker, the plan developed by the Milwaukee School Board restores my confidence in the desire and willingness of our citizens to rectify a serious problem in a most responsible and cooperative way.

We have all witnessed the violence and polarization created in some other cities as a result of court-ordered forced busing. We have all seen social disharmony and human suffering created when emotions take precedence.

Yesterday, September 7, Milwaukee's voluntary plan quietly went into effect. I am gratified to see that in Milwaukee, civic leaders have acted compassionately, intelligently and responsibly and have avoided the imposition of quick-fix solutions such as forced busing which could have well led to racial disharmony and discord within the Milwaukee community.

It is also gratifying to know that positive alternatives to forced busing were the basis of Milwaukee's school desegregation plan. The community of Milwaukee has demonstrated its desire to offer each and every student in Milwaukee the right to an equal opportunity to quality education.

Even more reassuring is the demonstrated willingness on the part of the community to make this plan, which was unanimously supported by the school board, work—resulting in an improved educational system for all our children.

Mr. Speaker, because Milwaukee's desegregation plan may prove adaptable and beneficial to other cities and communities trying to desegregate their public school systems, I would like to briefly summarize the development of the plan.

On January 19, 1976, the Federal Court ruled that the Milwaukee Public Schools were unlawfully segregated. The court found that school authorities had between 1950 and 1974 engaged in various practices with the apparent purpose, and having the effect, of creating a segregated school system.

The court further ruled that the task of devising an appropriate remedy to desegregate the schools of Milwaukee—the 15th largest school system in the country—should be formulated by a Special Master. The court did not spell out any specific guidelines or otherwise direct the Special Master, Dr. John Gronouski, as to the ultimate form that the remedial plan was to take but simply required the adoption of an approach consistent with the Constitution.

Work began immediately in the formulation of a plan to implement the peaceful integration of the schools. In an effort to be helpful, the many situations in many cities across the country were carefully studied resulting with 10 alternatives to forced busing to achieve racial balance. These alternatives with a detailed statement were submitted to the Special Master for his consideration.

On February 9, the Milwaukee Teachers Education Association formally requested to officially participate in the desegregation planning. Less than a month later, the School Board approved the formation of the Committee of 100, an organization of parents, students, and

teachers to participate in the planning for the voluntary desegregation plans proposed by the School Administration.

During the following months, formal public hearings were held, many channels of community input were utilized, statements were submitted, and studies on financial resources conducted.

Less than 6 months later, a voluntary integration plan was unanimously approved by the Milwaukee School Board members. The Special Master, leaders of the civic, business, labor communities and many parents expressed strong support for the integration plan which was based on voluntary and educational incentives.

On July 7, the Federal Judge accepted the voluntary integration plan in its entirety.

Mr. Speaker, here is an example of a peaceful and effective solution to the complex problems of segregation developed by the people and accomplished in a responsible and positive manner. This plan is not based on forced busing. It does not breed violence or hate. It is not disruptive to children, parents or to the community. It is intended to result in an improved educational system for all the students of Milwaukee.

It is voluntary and addresses the heart of the problem: equal opportunity and quality education. Citizens, administrators, and community leaders have pledged to make it work. And most importantly: it is working.

Specifically, the Milwaukee integration plan proposes that the first year 1976-77 will offer the voluntary transfer of students. The second and third years are extensions of the first-year plan. At the end of 3 years, each school in the system will have between 25 percent to 45 percent minority students.

Voluntary transfer of students will be accomplished through the installation of "specialty courses" at certain senior high schools. Specialties in the areas of computers, medicine, broadcast communications, economy, government, and law will be offered. Certain schools will merge grades at the junior high school level to readjust racial imbalance. At the elementary level, five schools will reopen as city-wide specialty schools involved in such areas as Montessori, open education and fundamental education. In addition, open and new voluntary transfers will be allowed when they contribute to racial balance.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to underscore my gratification over the development of this plan and its final approval by the Federal court. Surely all our cities interested in assuring that their children are guaranteed the right to equal opportunity and quality education can learn from the example set by the citizens of Milwaukee.

The Milwaukee experience has shown us that a willingness of the people at the local level to implement a voluntary integration plan that affords all children the guaranteed access to quality education based on communitywide input and support can become a reality.

Along these lines, I would like to share with my colleagues two statements

which demonstrate the willingness and support of both the labor and business community in Milwaukee to implement a feasible voluntary program of integration. One is a statement by Mr. Werner J. Schaefer, president of the Milwaukee County Labor Council, AFL-CIO; the other, a statement by Mr. Edward Watson, chairman of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce. From these statements one can readily see the commitment made by labor and business leaders to implementing a voluntary and effective integration plan in Milwaukee's public school system;

WHY MILWAUKEE LABOR SUPPORTS INTEGRATION

(Statement by Werner J. Schaefer)

Some representatives of the media and certain others in our community have been pressing for a statement relating to the position of the Milwaukee County Labor Council AFL-CIO on the Milwaukee School Board plan developed by Supt. Lee R. McMurrin to begin desegregating the Milwaukee School System in response to the Federal Court order issued by Judge John W. Reynolds.

It hardly seems necessary to address the philosophical question of whether we favor the proposition of free public quality education being available equally to all in our country and our community regardless of sex, color, race and religious beliefs on one hand, and whether, on the other hand, we should comply with court decisions on the subject which has been unanimous since 1954.

On the question of free public education, the organized labor movement in our country has been the dominant force from its very beginning pushing for the opportunity for every one to obtain a free and equal education regardless of financial status or racial background. The organized labor movement also has been dedicated to compliance with law even though in some instances a particular law may be unpopular or distasteful to some of us individually.

The National AFL-CIO by whom the Milwaukee County Labor Council is chartered and of which we are a part, has repeatedly and consistently through action of its conventions, its executive councils and its leadership reiterated its support of any measures which are required to achieve both free quality education for all and compliance with law.

The Milwaukee County Labor Council, as an arm of the National AFL-CIO, is bound to observe and support its policies and positions. Even without this requirement and necessity, however, the Milwaukee County Labor Council, by its very nature of being itself an integrated institution, dedicated to the principle of securing equal opportunity for all, would be expected to support efforts to desegregate our educational system, voluntary or court mandated.

Milwaukee has a unique opportunity to integrate its public schools under a voluntary plan prepared by its school administration, approved unanimously by its school board, the court appointed Special Master, John Gronouski, and Federal Judge John Reynolds. This opportunity places upon our community a great responsibility to support the plan and to work for its successful implementation.

As president of the Milwaukee County Labor Council, knowing the traditional position of the National AFL-CIO on this specific question and the position of the Milwaukee County Labor Council on open housing and similar equal opportunity legislation, I have no hesitancy in pledging the support of the Milwaukee County Labor Council for the plan and I join with the many other religious, civic and community organizations and their leaders in urging all

residents of the Milwaukee metropolitan area to support this effort and for those who are eligible to cooperate voluntarily.

It may be the only opportunity Milwaukee will have to desegregate its school system with a plan drawn locally by educators on the basis of improving the system for all.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION POLICY STATEMENT

Following Federal Judge John Reynolds' order encompassing the plan to desegregate Milwaukee schools, Association of Commerce Chairman Edward Watson issued the following statement on behalf of the Association:

"The Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce urges full cooperation of all segments of the community in the implementation of the approved plan for integration of the city's public schools.

"It is hoped that the community will apply itself diligently and enthusiastically to making the voluntary plan work, so that it can be carried out promptly, smoothly and systematically.

"The plan, developed by Milwaukee School Supt. Lee R. McMurrin, has been approved unanimously by the School Board, has received the recommendation of Special Master John Gronouski and has been ordered by Federal Judge John W. Reynolds. All deserve commendation for achieving agreement on the proposal which was worked out after many weeks of study, hearings, debate and consultation involving individuals representing diverse backgrounds and viewpoints.

"Basically, the approved proposal would integrate 66 schools, largely on a voluntary basis, although it contains mandatory backup provisions if voluntary response fails to meet goals. Under the plan, five high schools and 15 elementary schools would be designated as specialty schools which would serve as "magnets" to attract voluntary transfers. The plan also establishes school zones and leagues within those zones.

"An intelligent and reasonable effort on the part of all can bring about successful integration of the schools and make a substantial contribution to creating the type of atmosphere conducive to making available quality education.

"The Association again urges concerned parties in the suburbs—school administrators, public officials, parents, civic and business leaders, parent-teacher associations—also to join in a voluntary integration effort under provisions of the new state law offering incentives in that direction. Failure to take the initiative is certain to provoke ultimate mandatory integration orders which would eliminate voluntary options now available.

"The Association appeals to the entire community for total commitment to implementation of the approved integration plan, to place our schools in full compliance with the law of the land."

SEND FOR HAYM SALOMON

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a special pleasure to bring to the attention of the Members of this body a fascinating and exceptionally well-written volume entitled "Send for Haym Salomon," by Vick Knight, Jr. The book is enhanced by the many drawings and paintings by Joseph M. Henniger, which contribute another dimension to the spirit and feeling of this story about one of our Nation's great patriots.

We are obligated to Mr. Knight for

reminding us of the debt our country owes—both in terms of patriotism and money given and raised for the Continental Army by Salomon—and not fully acknowledged by succeeding generations. I hope this valuable book will come into the hands of all, young and old, who do not fully know this inspirational story.

WILLIS REED HONORED FOR 20 YEARS AS PASTOR AT ELGIN'S FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's Bicentennial has provided the occasion to commemorate many historic events. In this year in my 13th Illinois Congressional District the members of the First Baptist Church of Elgin are commemorating Dr. Willis A. Reed's 20th anniversary of service as their pastor. Dr. Reed was called to the First Baptist Church of Elgin in September 1956 after almost 15 years of prior service as pastor of the First Baptist Church of East Moline, Ill. and of the First Baptist Church of Canton, Ill., in addition to lengthy and exemplary service as chaplain of the U.S. Army.

Willis Reed's Christian services as an Army chaplain and as a Baptist pastor have influenced and blessed the lives of all with whom he has come in contact. During more than 3 years of service in the U.S. Army in the Pacific area during World War II, Willis Reed supplied the religious and spiritual needs for the men and women of the Army in combat areas. He was with the 7th Infantry Division in the Philippines and in Okinawa. Later, he was present in Seoul, Korea in connection with the surrender of the Manchurian-Japanese Army in 1945 and did occupation duty for a year following that event.

In addition to his pastorate at the First Baptist Church in Elgin, Willis Reed has served on the Green Lake Laboratory School staff of the American Baptist Assembly and has also served in many youth camps for the Baptist State Convention and the Chicago Baptist Association.

Willis Reed's contributions have also included many civic and community projects, including such important posts as chairman of the Elgin Chapter of the American Red Cross, chairman of the Elgin United Community Fund, secretary of the Judson College board of trustees, chaplain of the Illinois Police Association and the National Police Association. He is a past president of the Canton, Ill. Rotary Club and has a record of 27 years of perfect attendance as a Rotarian. He is a member of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other military organizations.

Dr. Reed is a colonel in the Ready Reserve Chaplains Corps of the U.S. Army assigned to the 86th U.S. Army Command. He is a life member of the Military Chaplains Association of the Armed Forces and the Reserve Officers Association.

tion of the United States. He was awarded the U.S. Army Commendation Medal in September 1965 and served as chairman of the National Military Chaplains Convention of the Armed Forces in Chicago, Ill., in 1970.

Willis Reed received the Golden Eagle Award from Judson College in recognition of outstanding service in 1972 and was made a life member of the American Legion in 1974. He received an honor citation from the Daily Courier-News in Elgin in 1974 and in 1975 was saluted by the Elgin Township Republican organization as the man of the year for his outstanding community service. During this Bicentennial Year he served as the grand marshal of Elgin's Bicentennial parade.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Willis Reed is much more than the recipient of high honors for his exemplary civic, community, and military service. He is a friend to many thousands throughout the Elgin area, including many who are unaffiliated with the Baptist Church and who are not members of his congregation. I am privileged to know Willis Reed as a friend during the recent years of my service in this House during which time Elgin and most of Kane County have formed an important part of the 13th Illinois Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, many of Willis Reed's accomplishments have found his wife Sarah at his side. While he celebrates his 20th year as pastor of the Elgin Baptist Church, Dr. and Mrs. Reed are this year celebrating their 34th wedding anniversary. Their three sons and one daughter complete this Christian family which is representative of the very finest in American life today.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to be in attendance at the ceremonies honoring Dr. Willis Reed on Sunday, September 19. In any event, I am proud to call to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues in this House this record of human and humanitarian service contributed by a true man of God and of the people, Dr. Willis A. Reed.

TWO HUNDRED YEARS AGO TODAY

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago, on September 5, 1776, after several days of intense controversy, the Continental Congress decided to send a committee to meet with Lord Howe in order to determine how much authority he had to conduct peace negotiations. In a letter to a fellow delegate from New Hampshire, Josiah Bartlett discussed the dilemma Congress had faced during the debate over Lord Howe's request for a meeting:

If the Congress should accept of the proposed conference only a verbal message, when at the same time Lord Howe declares he can consider them only as private gentlemen, especially when we are certain he can have no power to grant any terms we can possibly accept, this I fear will lessen the Congress in the eye of the public and per-

haps at this time intimidate people when they see us catching hold of so slender a thread to bring about a settlement. On the other hand, if we should refuse the conference, I fear the Tories and moderate men so called will try to represent the Congress as obstinate and so desirous of war and bloodshed that we would not so much as hear the proposals Lord Howe had to make, which they will represent (as they already do) to be highly advantageous for America—even that he would consent that we should be independent provided we would grant some advantages as to trade. Such an idea, spread among the people, especially the soldiers, at this time, might be of the most fatal consequence. . .

BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH AND MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY PROTECTION ACT OF 1976

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation establishing a National Commission on the Implications of Biomedical Research and Medical Technology.

On August 24, 1976, the Office of Technology Assessment issued its study, "Development of Medical Technology: Opportunities for Assessment." The OTA report addresses the need for assessing the potential social and policy impacts of medical technologies while such technologies are in the developmental stages. Specifically, the OTA study formulates an initial set of questions that might be used to generate information about the effects and policy implications of such new medical technologies.

Advances in medical technology have transformed medical practice in the 20th century. Each of us individually and society as a whole has benefited greatly from advances in biomedical research. We can see this most clearly when we consider a wide variety of innovative, life-saving medical technologies which have been developed in recent years. Some diseases can be effectively prevented. Others are treatable upon early detection. Diagnostic procedures and screening techniques have been greatly improved. Medical innovations such as antibiotics have provided effective therapies for a number of heretofore "killer" diseases. Significant advances in the practice of medicine enable us to live longer, more productive lives.

Nevertheless, the quality of medical care cannot be measured exclusively by the quantity of available medical services or the availability of costly, sophisticated medical technologies. Recently, health professionals, policymakers, and the public have become increasingly aware of the limitations of certain "advanced" medical technology and treatment procedures. Medical experts have begun to question the conventional wisdom of heretofore accepted procedures—from the annual comprehensive physical examination to the advisability of tonsillectomies and hysterectomies.

The "technological imperative" can and must be harnessed to serve the pub-

lic health interest. Fulfillment of our quest—quality medical care—requires an assessment of the benefits and risks associated with recent advances on medical technology. Quality assurance, fiscal responsibility, cost-effective and rational allocation of medical care dollars are predicated upon obtaining such knowledge.

This legislation which I am introducing establishes a National Commission to review and evaluate the state of the arts in medical technology. The Commission mandate is to undertake continuing and periodic studies to analyze and evaluate the medical, social, economic, ethical, and legal implications, for individuals and society, of advances in biomedical research and medical technology and of the adoption of such advances in medical practice.

Specifically, this legislation requires that Commission studies include review and evaluations of: First, the existing laws governing and ethical principles relating to; second, the relative risks and benefits associated with; third, the impact on the overall cost of health care services of; and fourth, the public's attitudes toward and understanding of the use in medical practice, and pattern of the use of such advances.

Medical technology is defined as the set of techniques, drugs, equipment, and procedures used by health care professionals in delivering medical care to individuals and the systems within which such care is delivered.

Commission membership shall include individuals who are or have been engaged in the advancement of biomedical research and medical technologies and individuals who represent the different sectors of society affected by advances in biomedical research and medical technology. Membership on the Commission shall, also, reflect expertise in the fields of medicine, science, law, ethics, theology, social science, public affairs, and health administration, planning and advocacy.

A complementary aspect of quality assurance in medical care is the protection of patient rights and the rights of individuals involved in biomedical research. This legislation, also, requires that the Commission undertake a number of special studies which address issues related to the rights of subjects for human research and patients undergoing medical treatment. Specifically, the Commission's mandate includes the following special studies:

First. An evaluation of the appropriateness of applying the principles and guidelines, identified and developed by the Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical Research, to the delivery of health services to patients under programs conducted or supported by any Federal agency.

Second. The development of a model research subjects' bill of rights, with recommendations concerning the appropriate mechanisms to implement such a bill of rights in biomedical and behavioral research projects conducted or supported by any Federal agency.

Third. A review and evaluation of current laws and practices affecting the rights of patients of hospitals, nursing homes, and other health care institu-

tions, development of model medical patients' bill of rights, with recommendations for implementation of such a bill of rights with respect to individuals receiving health services from or supported by any Federal agency.

Additional provisions in the legislation provide for studies relating to:

First, the need for establishing uniform medical records systems for use in the delivery of health services to patients under programs conducted or supported by any Federal agency; second, the appropriateness of establishing a uniform records system on subjects of biomedical and behavioral research for the purpose of facilitating appropriate followup medical care.

Our tragic experience with the use of EDS illustrates the need to develop a capability for tracking patients receiving certain types of therapy—especially where appropriate followup medical care may be required.

Clearly, such a medical records system must insure that privacy rights are protected, and that access to such records is limited to persons who have a bona fide medical reason for seeking information.

The miracles of modern medicine are a testament to man's creative and intellectual potential. The positive values of medical technology are indisputable.

Nonetheless, it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to take the lead in providing support for and focus to the assessment of medical technology by those who develop such technologies and those who are affected by advances in medical technology. The public's access to quality care demands such an investment.

NATIONAL YOUTH VOLUNTEER MONTH

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call attention to a large group of unselfish, dedicated citizens who are rarely, if ever, applauded for their many services to the American public. I feel that it is only appropriate, while we salute our great Nation in this year of the Bicentennial, that we also give special recognition to the widespread services of the youth volunteer groups across the country.

These young people perform a wide variety of duties in many of our public and private service facilities, ranging from candy stripping in our hospitals, assisting in our nursing homes and day-care centers to aiding the needy and underprivileged. Many of us who are aware of their indispensable services are

also aware of the fact that they are rarely acknowledged for them.

As a cosponsor of legislation to designate October as National Youth Volunteer Month, I believe that it is time for us to give an official thanks to this significant portion of our population. These young citizens represent the leaders of tomorrow and they deserve this long overdue gesture of gratitude.

USE OF ILLICIT DRUGS

HON. W. G. (BILL) HEFNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems facing our country and our schools is the increasing use of illicit drugs by our young people. In some schools the problem is reaching critical proportions.

The very worst habit anybody can ever acquire is the use of drugs as a means of escaping from reality. Drugs all too often doom the lives of those young people who use them and rob the families of the drug users of their happiness and, in a large measure, of their hopes and dreams for their children.

Drug use which was once confined to the "street culture" has already become a feature of college life in our country and is increasing in our high schools. Now, even our elementary schools are being invaded by illicit drugs. Few schools are immune to the problem.

A part of this problem, and ample evidence exists to show it, is that many drugs are sold by nonstudents or other individuals who come onto school grounds or hang around school neighborhoods to supply their student customers. This is a cause of concern among law enforcement officers, school administrators, teachers, and parents. I share their concern.

I think we have to come to the realization that people who sell drugs to our young people are criminals and should be treated accordingly. I personally believe that the selfish individuals who traffic in drugs should be given the harshest punishment the law knows.

Our main legal tool against the drug problem, the Controlled Substances Act of 1970, already provides penalties for persons who illegally distribute or dispense controlled substances. Furthermore, the act goes on to double these penalties for individuals selling drugs to persons under 21 years of age. This, of course, begins to deal with the problem of drugs in our schools.

I am introducing legislation today which will carry this effort further. This bill would supplement the provisions of the Controlled Substances Act to identify specifically the problem of drugs being sold on or adjacent to school property and provide mandatory sentences for in-

dividuals convicted of this offense. I hope this will be a strong tool which will go directly to the problem of drug pushers in our schools.

More specifically, this bill says that a person, 18 years of age or older, who violates the Controlled Substances Act by manufacturing, distributing, or dispensing a controlled substance on or within 100 feet of the grounds of a public or private elementary or secondary school will receive certain additional penalties. Differing from the Controlled Substances Act, this bill prescribes a minimum as well as a maximum sentence. Further additional penalties are prescribed for second or subsequent convictions of the same offense. The bill also provides that these sentences may not be suspended and that probation may not be granted. Persons sentenced under this proposed law would not be eligible for parole until serving at least the minimum sentence prescribed by the bill.

The purpose of this bill is to deal with those persons who have no business in or around our schools except to sell drugs to students. I realize that the bill does not extend to the problem of drug traffic among the students themselves. And I understand that this too is a real and serious problem, but these matters are generally handled by school officials in cooperation with local law enforcement agencies. In addition, a harsh attitude toward outside drug pushers would not only be a warning to the student pusher, it would also go a long way toward drying up these students' sources of illicit drugs.

I feel that an important part of this bill is that provision for mandatory sentences for violators. This harsh step is necessary because all too often the courts have failed to provide the necessary sentences for drug pushers. A questionnaire I recently distributed to my constituents showed that 53 percent of the respondents feel lenient courts are the principal cause of rising crime. And 96 percent of them feel that mandatory sentences for serious crimes, including drug violations, are a necessary step to deal with the crime problem. I believe the citizens of this country are calling for action.

I have consulted with law enforcement officers, educators, and parents in my district and State about the drug problem and possible solutions. I believe these concerned and involved people are in support of the bill I am introducing today. In fact, the attorney general of North Carolina has informed me that he would welcome such legislation as an aid to local and State efforts to deal with the problem of drugs in our schools.

I am certainly not interested in involving the Federal Government any more than it already is in the affairs of our schools, nor do I want to interfere with the work of our State and local law enforcement bodies, which, after all, are the frontline in the war on crime of all sorts. This bill is not an intrusion into our schools or local law enforcement, but it is another tool, to be used where ap-

propriate, to assist with the problem of drugs.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide increased penalties for illegal distributions of controlled substances in or adjacent to elementary and secondary schools.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part D of the Controlled Substances Act is amended by adding after section 405 the following new section:

"DISTRIBUTIONS IN OR NEAR SCHOOLS

"SEC. 405A. (a) Any person at least eighteen years of age who violates section 401 (a)(1) by distributing a controlled substance in or on, or within 100 feet of, the real property comprising a public or private elementary or secondary school is (except as provided in subsection (b)) punishable (1) by a term of imprisonment of not less than 3 years and not more than 10 years, and (2) at least twice any special parole term authorized by section 401(b) for a first offense involving the same controlled substance and schedule.

"(b) Any person at least eighteen years of age who violates section 401(a)(1) by distributing a controlled substance in or on, or within 100 feet of, the real property comprising a public or private elementary or secondary school after a prior conviction or convictions under subsection (a) have become final is punishable (1) by a term of imprisonment of not less than 8 years and not more than 20 years, and (2) at least three times any special parole term authorized by section 401(b) for a second or subsequent offense involving the same controlled substance and schedule.

"(c) In the case of any sentence imposed under subsection (a) or (b), imposition or execution of such sentence shall not be suspended and probation shall not be granted. An individual convicted under subsection (a) or (b) shall not be eligible for parole under section 4202 of title 18 of the United States Code until the individual has served the minimum sentence required by such subsection."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 401(b) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 841(b)) is amended by inserting "or 405A" after "405".

(b) Section 401(c) of such Act is amended by inserting "405A" after "405" each place it occurs.

(c) Section 405 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 845) is amended by striking out "Any" in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in section 405A, and".

MRS. AUGUSTA MAIN CELEBRATES
100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JOHN L. BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of pride that I announce to the House of Representatives the 100th birthday of one of my constituents, Mrs. Augusta Main of San Francisco.

On September 9, 1976, Mrs. Main will be joined by her family, friends, and neighbors at a birthday celebrating this landmark achievement.

She has lived a full and interesting life, and has seen an incredible range of historical, scientific, and social changes in the world since her birth in 1876.

Mrs. Main was born in Ostru, Furtan, Sweden, and emigrated to the United States when she was 17 years old. After living in Sacramento, Calif., she moved to Mexico where she stayed for 13 years, then moved to Arizona where she lived from 1916 to 1918. In 1918 she returned to California where she has resided ever since.

Whenever someone reaches their centennial observance, they are often asked what their "secret" is for their longevity. Whatever Mrs. Main's formula, it has worked exceedingly well, and I am quite proud that I can count her as being one of my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of Congress join with me in extending best wishes to Mrs. Augusta Main for a very happy 100th birthday, and hope that the years ahead will continue to be happy, healthy, and fruitful ones for her.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. G. HAMILTON
MOWBRAY

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, once again one of Maryland's most distinguished citizens has been honored for his efforts to establish a quality wine industry in that State. Dr. G. Hamilton Mowbray of Silver Run in Carroll County, Md., was honored at the residence of the French Ambassador, M. Jacques Kosciuszko-Morizet. Dr. Mowbray was presented the award of Croix de Chevalier de Merite Agricole by the Ambassador. Dr. Mowbray was the second American to be so honored.

Dr. Mowbray established the first successful commercial planting in Maryland of the famed white Burgundy grape, the Chardonnay, and has marketed the wine from it locally for the past several years. He is also credited with producing the first table wine in the United States entirely from a French-developed grape known as the Seyval Blanc. A former member of the Principal Professional Staff of the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory and a founding member of the American Wine Society, Dr. Mowbray devotes his time to his winery and his extensive vineyards in Carroll County. He also lectures on wine at the University of Maryland.

Mowbray developed a love for European wines while getting a doctorate in experimental psychology in England. He and his wife could not find the wines they wanted at an affordable price when they returned to America so he began his own winery as a backyard hobby. This hobby later developed into a full-time business.

I would like to congratulate Dr. Mowbray on his achievement and his efforts to develop the wine industry in this area. The French award is well deserved.

CONSUMER COOPERATIVE BANK

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14829, the national consumer cooperative bank bill, has recently been reported by the House Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing. This bill would establish a bank for the purpose of lending money to consumer cooperatives, which are currently discriminated against by commercial lenders.

Without adding to an overgrown bureaucracy, and without handouts or giveaways, this bank proposal holds great promise for the revitalization of degenerating rural and innercity communities. Furthermore, cooperatives are self-help organizations, enabling consumers to protect their interests in the marketplace—thus helping to reduce their dependence on government watchdog agencies.

Soon the bill will be considered by the entire House. In the hearings held by the Banking Committee, Mr. Ralph Nader offered provocative evidence and arguments in support of the bill. So that all Members of this body may have the benefit of his views on the National Consumer Cooperative Bank, I include Mr. Nader's statement in the RECORD: STATEMENT OF RALPH NADER, JUNE 29, 1976

Mr. Chairman, Secretary of Treasury William Simon often decries what he calls the "economic illiteracy" of the American people, but his opposition to fostering the economic independence of consumers through the self-help mechanism provided in the Consumer Cooperative Bank Bill, H.R. 14512, actually reflects the corporate power that has kept consumers from becoming an organized economic force in the economy. Classical economic theory originally argued that the marketplace had one goal—the satisfaction of consumer desires. But today college economics courses ignore the concept of consumer sovereignty. Most courses deal only with the production part of the economy, even though teaching economics without focusing on the consumer is like teaching democracy without emphasizing the voter.

When he premised his economic theory upon the presence of consumer bargaining power, Adam Smith did not discuss the consumer cooperative, but through the organization which a cooperative structure provides, real consumer bargaining power is assured. Consumer cooperatives are based upon the principles of open membership, operating at cost, and democratic control (one person, one vote). The owners of the shares of the firm are the consumers of its goods and/or services. Their reward for ownership and participation is higher quality of goods and services at the lowest cost possible. The operating incentives for a cooperative are just the reverse of an investor-owned profit-making firm. Since few markets are characterized by perfect competition, an ordinary business has every incentive to maximize profit by encouraging unnecessary purchases, withholding (or distorting) essential information, using cheap materials, and charging high prices. Only to the extent that consumers have dependable information and alternatives, will the ability of producers to exploit consumers in this fashion be limited.

Where the marketplace has failed to discipline producers, the consumer movement has sought to eliminate these unfair business practices through regulatory legislation. But, even when legislative battles are won, lax enforcement of the law, the absence of adequate penalties for anti-consumer behavior, or the difficulty of overseeing millions of business transactions involving people determined to engage in such fraudulent activity, undermine the modest reforms which may actually have been achieved. This should not be surprising. Consumers are recognizing that they must organize economically, as well as be active as citizens, because only through reliance on both the market and the government, each compensating for the flaws in the other, will the rights and desires of consumers be recognized and protected.

Over the years, the government has decided to distribute financial aid to solve this country's economic problems almost entirely in one way: by the care and feeding of the producer side of the economy. The consumer side has been virtually ignored:

Federal subsidies go to the producer side. Loan guarantees go to the producer side. Tax preferences go largely to the producer side.

Research and development funds go to the producer side.

In contrast, HR 14512 gives consumers a fraction of the support, and then only until the cooperatives assume ownership of the proposed Bank, routinely provided for producers by the Federal government.

The Ford Administration has expressed its opposition to this proposal. It has had to do ideological somersaults to do so, given its huge financial support of numerous special pleaders. The Lockheed loan guarantee (and its other government subsidies) which had the avid support of then Congressman Gerald Ford, is the most infamous example, but hardly the largest one. President Ford has approved loan programs or outright subsidies for small businesses, shipbuilders, landlords, banks, farmers, oil companies, coal companies, and exporters, among others, and this list does not even include the huge expenditures by various federal agencies which foster and promote business interests. Meanwhile, consumers wishing to borrow money to form a cooperative enterprise are not even accorded the blessing of Administration silence, much less its support.

The Bank for Consumer Cooperatives has been carefully structured to protect the private sector. While the bank is initially loaned money by the Treasury to begin its operations, it must go to the private capital markets for the bulk of its future funds, where it will compete with other capital needs. The government's involvement is needed to open the capital markets to cooperatives which have been locked out by the bias of banks against them regardless of size. The government's role in this program merely enables cooperatives to compete in the capital markets themselves. It does not transfer capital from the private sector. Consumer cooperatives would not be dipping into the bottomless well of government support that sustains various producer groups.

Ironically, Secretary Simon, the reputed voice of private enterprise, has advocated placing cooperatives on the government bankroll indefinitely, by putting this lending facility within the Small Business Administration. His confusion of private enterprise with investor owned corporate enterprise is not unusual in government these days. A few months ago the Department of Commerce gave about a quarter million dollars to the advertising industry to start a public relations campaign boosting what it called the "free enterprise system," where it really meant investor-owned corporate enterprise and not alternative free-enterprise consumer-owned businesses. This use of tax-

payer's funds to promote one segment of an economy's participants is obviously preferential treatment and need to be scrutinized. It is a typical reflection of the Department of Commerce's interest in investor-owned corporations and disinterest in helping consumer owned industry and commerce. Not only are large concentrated economic forces in the private sector arrayed against consumer ownership, but government policies supporting these concentrated producers are arrayed against them as well.

A further irony in the Administration's position is that many of these corporate institutions have abandoned markets serving critical consumer needs throughout the country. This is a trend recognized by the Banking Committee. The familiar phrase "redlining" essentially refers to abandonment of markets in major areas of cities by insurance companies and banks and, of course, that in turn leads to further economic deterioration of these areas where people live and spend their money. A study conducted by Dr. Donald Marlon, associate professor of food marketing at the University of Massachusetts, found that inner-city stores were being abandoned at a rapid, and increasing, rate throughout the country. In terms of food store selling space per person, Newark, New Jersey, has only .4 square feet in poverty areas compared to 2.1 square feet elsewhere in the city. In Washington, D.C., says the March 1975 report "Exodus of Food Chain Stores," prepared by the City's Municipal Planning office, the years between 1968 and 1974 saw a 33% reduction in the number of city supermarkets. One impact of the food shortage resulting when supermarkets leave is the increased dependence upon the remaining stores and their inflated prices, or fast food restaurants. Meanwhile, empty buildings and reduced employment in these areas are both breeding grounds for crime.

Already producers have offered their solutions to public officials on both the federal and local level to the problem of abandonment of the inner-city market: subsidies for chain stores and agribusiness in the form of free land, rent subsidies, and tax reduction to encourage them to sell cheap food in the inner-city. If the federal government follows its traditional policies of producer-oriented financial support, years from now the problem will remain with us, but Congress will be unwilling to eliminate these programs, even though no one can prove they work, because a producer constituency will have developed which is dependent upon them.

The legislation to create a Bank for Consumer Cooperatives is a novel approach because it aids consumers directly, avoiding the faults of the producer-oriented remedies while assuring the one requirement which most food operations, especially those in the inner-city, have found to be essential for success: community support. While investor-owned firms have written off the inner-city situation as a failure on their books and their taxes, cooperatives see it as a very important opportunity. Cooperatives can assist areas of cities which have been economically devastated or abandoned but which still possess a consumer cash flow that can be part of a consumer cooperative subeconomy, recycling the consumer dollar several times through consumer cooperative food stores, cooperative health clinics, and many other consumer cooperatives mutually supporting themselves. But time is of the essence. A & P in the last two years abandoned about 1,000 inner-city stores, leaving residents without ready access to alternatives and leaving that purchasing power and real estate available to form the foundation for an expanded consumer cooperative development. As long as the consumer cash flow remains, a cooperative can succeed.

Cooperatives will aid community development in ways a national chain store can-

not, even when the chain store prospers. A chain store sends a portion of its profit back to the corporation headquarters, which is usually located in a national money center, where it is put in a major bank like the Chase Manhattan or Bank of America. Needless to say, no inner-city community will see that money again. But a cooperative will return what a chain store would consider to be profit back to the consumer in the form of a rebate. This money is then spent in other community enterprises, or placed in community banks.

This bill must be considered one of the three most important consumer bills in the past generation. It deals with economic and civic reconstruction and expansion on a self-help basis through an alternative economic organization that is rooted in the community and the neighborhood. It increases consumer bargaining power, and develops the necessary political power which economic institutions everywhere inevitably use to influence all levels of government. This is important to emphasize because so much of the maldistribution of political power is a result of the maldistribution of economic power.

This proposal helps to accomplish such progress by seeing to it that there is an adequate source of credit for consumer cooperatives. Consumer cooperatives have been the object of avoidance by banks. This is recognized even by opponents of consumer cooperatives and this legislation. Yet, despite the difficulty of obtaining financial assistance, public interest in consumer cooperatives is rising. The Cooperative League of the United States received two thousand requests for information on consumer cooperatives, twice those of the previous year. In the past two years an auto repair cooperative in Michigan has received 100 requests for information on that type of cooperative alone. Yet the manager of the cooperative testified before the Senate that the odds were one hundred to one against any one of them getting started due to the difficulty of obtaining credit and technical assistance. More and more books are published each year on cooperatives, everything from histories to "how-to" books. The idea has inspired numerous newspaper articles, some of which I would like to introduce into the record.

Some public officials are finally promoting the cooperatives as a form of economic organization that deserves government support. A few examples: Governor Michael Dukakis indicated recently in a letter to the Washington Post that the promotion of food cooperatives is a vital part of his food program in Massachusetts, and a food cooperative there received some small financial assistance from the state. State Assemblyman Andrew Stein of New York has proposed the formation of health cooperatives for Medicaid patients as a way of saving the state \$700 million fraud, overcharges, and unnecessary surgery.

The cooperative form of organization can provide savings across the spectrum of government subsidy programs. The costs of this proposal, quite apart from the fact that the bank will eventually be out of the Government's hands (and pocketbook) and will ultimately be owned by the consumer cooperatives themselves, should be compared to all of the other assistance to city rehabilitation, which has cost billions of dollars and has very often failed, in order to determine how this self-help proposal can replace more and more of these federal dollars. The attractiveness of this proposal is that it requires a community level of interest and organization as a precondition to its extension of credit, unlike other federal programs which come roaring in, gushing money at various developers, builders, and banks, and which have no guarantee that the goals are going to be accomplished because there's a large gap between the subsidized business interests and

the people that live in the community who are supposed to be helped.

The resurgence of interest in the development of cooperatives also is indicated by the number of new cooperatives started each year, and by the formation of new associations and federations of cooperatives, such as the North American Student Cooperative Association, organized in 1968 by representatives of a number of American and Canadian student cooperatives. In fact, the past ten years have witnessed a growth of new cooperatives which rivals the last period of rapid cooperative organization: the thirties. But the self-interested refusal by banks to give cooperatives the tools they need to sustain themselves threatens to suppress this groundswell of interest before cooperatives have the opportunity to prove their value and before they can become a recognized requirement for a healthy economy as they are in Europe.

One food co-op in Switzerland, the Migros cooperative, accounts for 25% of the retail food sales in Switzerland and 10% of all retail sales, making it the largest economic enterprise in the country. The Migros cooperative has been a leader in product innovation. It was the first to distribute low-lead gasoline in Europe. It has testing laboratories for quality control of the products purchased for their members. These testing procedures uncover fraud, filth, lack of nutrition, pesticides, and lately, harmful ecological effects. The Migros organization even holds extensive adult education classes, and has a bureau of prevention of bureaucratic abuses that handles citizens' complaints such as social security.

Fortunately, there are examples of cooperatives in the United States fulfilling the hope that beleaguered consumers have for them:

Congressional hearings have documented gross overcharging, price-fixing, and fraud in the auto repair business. But one need not look to legislative reforms to end this behavior. Co-op Auto of Ann Arbor, Michigan is one of the most successful of the auto repair co-ops, grossing about \$40,000 a month while emphasizing preventive maintenance and self-help as they are not stressed in the ordinary repair shop. Despite their difficulty in obtaining credit, this co-op, and other auto repair co-ops, are growing. Auto repair co-ops can now be found in Berkeley and Palo Alto, California; Madison, Wisconsin; Austin, Texas, and East Lansing, Michigan.

Co-op Optical Services in Detroit is a model of the progressive business which finds its self-interest is on the side of the consumer. This co-op battles legislation creating monopolistic market entry barriers, provides information to Congress on marketing of inferior quality lenses and frames all over the country, and has established its own optical aid fund for the poor. Because employees are salaried, they are not tempted to boost commissions by selling customers unnecessarily expensive lenses and frames or to cut costs through the use of inferior materials. A refraction examination by an optometrist costs \$9, compared to \$15 for examinations offered by a mass volume competitor. Similar economies prevail for eyeglasses.

The sporadic development of the optical cooperative concept indicates the importance of establishing a technical assistance capability for cooperatives. Already, optical co-ops have sprung up in Grand Rapids, Jackson, Lansing and Muskegon, Michigan, close to Co-op Optical Services in Detroit. In other areas the optical co-op is operated in conjunction with health co-ops, as in Seattle and in Washington, DC, or with supermarket co-ops as in New York. Clearly, the growth of the cooperative movement is obstructed by the absence of an agency which could give

fledgling cooperatives the aid and encouragement they presently receive only from other cooperatives which barely have sufficient resources of their own.

This is the potential, but each day the need for financing and assistance is displayed anew:

In Pittsburgh, Pa. 140 families purchased their housing development on a cooperative basis to avert a foreclosure by HUD. They are in urgent need of a maintenance facility to house grounds equipment, tools and supplies, and to meet basic OSHA health and sanitation requirements for their workers.

The Ann Arbor, Michigan, student housing and food cooperative, a model of stability and achievement since the thirties, was denied credit because it is a non-profit organization.

In Denver, Colorado, a small co-op grocery stretched its financing almost to the breaking point as it tried to replace a large supermarket chain which abandoned its inner-city store. Without adequate financing, it may fail to meet its members' needs.

A Navajo nation food and handicraft cooperative was refused a bank loan because of its limited capitalization.

An Austin, Texas, student cooperative was refused a bank loan for needed student housing because the bank was concerned about the student turnover in its membership.

In St. Paul, Minnesota, a married student housing cooperative with 400 apartments had a waiting list of 500 and no community facility for vital services such as daycare, baby clinics and children's play areas, despite having more than 1,000 children in residence. This cooperative remains unable to obtain financing for needed additional services such as a bookstore, grocery and pharmaceutical supplies, transportation, or auto repair. There are similar developments across the country, notably in Michigan, Massachusetts, California, Texas, and Oregon with unfilled needs and nowhere to go, according to Paul Merrill, a member of the board of the National Association of Housing Cooperatives.

Of course, the financial problems of new and emerging cooperatives are even worse. Buying clubs in New England, which want to obtain a warehouse, independent fishermen in South Carolina who could buy equipment cooperatively, or inner-city tenants in Kansas City who are fed up with the unresponsiveness endemic to the absentee landlord system are searching for financing for cooperatives. But none of these cooperatives has the government fostering its interests, as so many producers do, so they must wait until their own members can provide the capital. Given the expense of large capital outlays, that day may never come.

Experience demonstrates that the expansion of cooperatives benefits even those who do not choose to join them. Everyone benefits when an organization enters the marketplace that doesn't have the same interests as all the other firms in the industry. The cooperative is such an institution thereby providing yardstick competition. Everyone benefits when this competition yields lower prices, higher quality goods, and reliable information. And everyone benefits when cooperatives supply a structure to foster inner-city markets, inspiring the reconstruction of the impoverished areas of these cities.

The Consumer Cooperative Bank Bill says, in a very modest way, that there is not just one form of private economic organization in the United States, namely the investor-owned corporation (dominated by a few giant corporations), that can receive the recognition and support of public policy. There are other forms more efficient and equitable to the ultimate consumer—the consumer cooperatively-owned enterprises.

Thank you.

ACLU DISCUSSES FUNDAMENTAL DEFECTS IN FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE ACT

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1976, H.R. 12750 and S. 3197, has been the subject of much critical comment since its introduction last March. Committees of both Houses have conducted hearings on the bill. The Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Activities have reported the bill with amendments, to the full Senate.

In spite of the changes made by the Senate committees, the bill continues to generate strong opposition. On August 26, 1976, the American Civil Liberties Union forwarded a cogent memorandum to each Member of the Senate setting forth the fundamental defects in the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. It observed that the proposal "implicitly recognizes the possibility of the Executive's power to ignore the law in the name of national security—a doctrine that should be resoundingly denounced rather than accepted through a stance of passive neutrality."

Because this bill may be the topic of further hearings and debate in the House, I am having the ACLU memo reprinted here:

Most people would probably be surprised to learn that until 1968 there was no federal statute authorizing the use of electronic surveillance for law enforcement purposes. In fact, from 1934 until that time, federal law flatly prohibited electronic interception of communications and no wiretap evidence was admissible in court. 47 U.S.C. § 605. Perhaps more revealing of how much has changed is a quote from J. Edgar Hoover and Attorney General Robert Jackson in 1940: "Wiretapping will not be tolerated. . . . The discredit and suspicion which arises from the occasional use of wiretapping more than offsets the good."

When President Johnson acquiesced in signing the 1968 bill because of other provisions in that omnibus legislation of which he approved, he pledged not to use the new wiretap authority, urged its immediate repeal, and kept his promise and authorized no electronic surveillance for criminal investigations for his remaining months in office. It was Attorney General John Mitchell, fulfilling the campaign promise of "law and order", who signed the first application for a court-approved wiretap.

During the period prior to 1968, national security wiretapping remained in the shadows—without affirmative congressional authorization and in apparent violation of the letter of the 1934 law. Successive administrations continued the practice in varying degrees, keeping the full extent of national security wiretapping from the Congress and the people. Congress, in the 1968 wiretap law, refused to authorize electronic surveillance for national security purposes, though it was also unwilling to flatly prohibit the practice. The 1968 legislation only authorized wiretaps for criminal investigations, and then

only for a limited group of specified offenses.*

Now Congress is being asked to take the next step—to authorize electronic surveillance in the name of "national security" even when no criminal offense is the subject of the investigation. Now that we have become accustomed to some wiretapping, the inevitable occurs; we are asked for more. We are reminded again how easily we accept gradual losses of our privacy, and the liberty it protects.

The bill is S. 3197, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. It has been heralded by its sponsors as an important step forward in controlling national security wiretapping because it requires, in most cases, that a judicial warrant be obtained prior to initiating electronic surveillance. But S. 3197 prohibits the court from forcing the government agent to demonstrate that the target is truly a threat to national security and that the wiretap will in fact produce evidence of the target's clandestine activities. This leaves the bill as little more than a sham, giving only the appearance of meaningful safeguards against unwarranted invasions of privacy.

Under this bill the court must issue a wiretap warrant if it finds probable cause (a relatively low standard of proof) that the target is an "agent of a foreign power". This includes all non-Americans who are officers or employees of a foreign power, meaning ambassadors from foreign countries and their entire staffs, as well as employees of corporations like British Airways which is government controlled. In effect, the bill declares open season on foreign citizens. They need not be engaged in any clandestine activities. They are subject to wiretap at any time simply because of their status.

The bill also includes Americans among those who qualify as agents of a foreign power. Americans who, at the direction of a foreign power, engage in sabotage, terrorist or clandestine activities in violation of the criminal law are subject to electronic surveillance. Which provisions of the criminal code are to be considered under the broadly-defined terms "terrorist" and "clandestine" activities is unclear, but the effect is not. The effect will be to expand the list of crimes subject to wiretap investigation and, given the lesser showing required under this bill as compared to present law, to make it far easier to obtain a warrant for these offenses.

Also included is an American who, at the direction of a foreign power, covertly transfers information which a reasonable person would believe might harm the security of the United States. These latter activities need not involve a violation of the criminal law. The amount to a new, all-inclusive and overbroad definition of espionage with the result that the President retains authority to wiretap Americans who pose not enough of a threat to national security for their conduct to have been made criminal by Congress.

This ignores the fundamental and most important recommendation of the Church Committee—no citizen of the United States should be subject to any surveillance or investigation without a threshold showing of the probability of past, present or imminent future conduct in violation of the criminal law. Intelligence Activities and the Rights of Americans, Final Report of the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, Book II, U.S. Senate, 94th Cong., 2d Sess., pp 320-23 (1976). The Church Committee backed this recommendation with

the experience gained from a year-long investigation into intelligence activities, with unparalleled access to the files of so-called "national security" investigations. It should not be ignored.

Attorney General Levi argues that the current espionage statutes are inadequate and that spying activities are carried on which are not presently in violation of the law. The answer to that, however, is that if he can make a case that the current laws are too narrow, then Congress should draft—with great care—a new espionage statute. Instead, the Attorney General is seeking to authorize wiretapping for conduct he could not persuade the Congress, in the battle over S. 1, should be made criminal.

Under the Constitution, a wiretap is a "search" governed by the requirements and limitations imposed by the Fourth Amendment. *Berger v. New York*, 388 U.S. 41 (1967). There are sound reasons why the Fourth Amendment has been held to require probable cause to believe that a crime has been committed before a search will be authorized. The Fourth Amendment stands as the fundamental constitutional protection of the right of privacy—the right to be left alone in the absence of a compelling societal interest mandating the intrusion. *Katz v. United States*, 389 U.S. 347 (1967). It says, in effect, that the government is not authorized by the people to invade their privacy without a sound basis for believing that a crime has occurred and that evidence of this crime will be obtained in the search.

The Fourth Amendment provides that "no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause . . ." In the debate over S. 3197, the question has become "probable cause" to believe what? That a crime has been committed? Or, can a search fulfill the probable cause requirement in the absence of a connection to criminal activity?

This is not a question which would have occurred to the Framers of the Fourth Amendment. In accord with English common law, *Entick v. Carrington*, 19 How. St. Tr. 1029 (1765), they believed that a warrant could issue only for contraband, fruits or instrumentalities of a crime. "Mere evidence", such as private papers of an individual, could not be seized with a warrant under any circumstances. *Gouled v. United States*, 255 U.S. 298 (1920). Warrants were entangled with concepts from the law of property. The government could only seize those items that the possessor could not lawfully possess.

But those items subject to seizure—contraband, fruits and instrumentalities—all presuppose that a crime has been committed. It is criminal to possess those items declared to be contraband, such as narcotics. Fruits of crime, such as stolen goods, also presume the existence of a crime. And it was, and is, a crime in itself to possess certain instrumentalities, such as burglar's tools. Thus, the Framers could not even have conceived of a search not related to criminal activity. Although they did not talk in terms of probable cause that a crime has been committed, a search was permissible only if there was probable cause to believe that certain items, intimately associated with crime, could be found at the place to be searched.

In 1967, the Supreme Court abandoned the prohibition against the search for and seizure of "mere evidence". *Warden v. Hayden*, 387 U.S. 294 (1967). The permissible objects of a search were no longer limited to contraband, fruits and instrumentalities. However, the Court did not intend—nor would the history of the Fourth Amendment support—abandonment of the criminal standard:

"There must of course be a nexus—automatically provided in the case of fruits, instrumentalities or contraband—between the item to be seized and criminal behavior. Thus, in the case of 'mere evidence', probable

cause must be examined in terms of cause to believe that the evidence sought will aid in a particular apprehension or conviction." *Id.*, at 307.

Thus, even while abandoning the mere evidence rule, the Court explicitly retained the requirement that a relationship be demonstrated between the object to be seized and activity in violation of the criminal laws. Neither an historical analysis of the growth of Fourth Amendment doctrine, nor an analysis of the principal case relaxing the limitations on items subject to seizure, supports the argument that a search can be conducted under the Fourth Amendment for items not associated with criminal activity.

Those who would justify this departure from the criminal standard quote the following passage from the *Keith* case, *United States v. United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan*, 407 U.S. 297, 322-323 (1972):

"Different standards may be compatible with the Fourth Amendment if they are reasonable both in relation to the legitimate need of Government for intelligence information and the protected rights of our citizens. For the warrant application may vary according to the governmental interest to be enforced and the nature of citizen rights deserving protection."

Justice Powell's dicta is based on the administrative search cases. In these cases, see e.g. *Camara v. Municipal Court*, 387 U.S. 523 (1967), *See v. Seattle*, 387 U.S. 541 (1967), the Court sanctioned the use of area warrants whereby municipal authorities might inspect a business or a dwelling for housing code violations, not upon probable cause that the dwelling was in violation of a particular housing code provision but upon general experience that dwellings in a particular area are likely to be in violation of the code.

The administrative search cases are a weak reed upon which to rest such a dangerous relaxation of Fourth Amendment standards. None of these cases in fact represents a deliberate search for information unrelated to criminal activity, as does S. 3197. The searches were to enforce and find criminal violations of the housing code. Second, none of these cases deal with potentially sensitive political activities. The Court has recognized the convergence of the Fourth and First Amendments: "Historically the struggle for freedom of speech and press in England was bound up with the issue of the scope of the search and seizure power." *Mareus v. Search Warrant*, 367 U.S. 717, 724 (1961). In *Keith* itself, the Court emphasized this relationship. *U.S. v. U.S. District Court*, supra at 313. Third, the administrative search cases deal a much less intrusive invasion of privacy. A walk-through of a dwelling seeking compliance with a housing code is hardly comparable to 90 days of electronic surveillance gathering every communication—whether or not relevant—made from a particular facility. The degree of intrusiveness is an important factor in determining the quality and degree of justification that must be provided for a search. See *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1 (1968) holding that "reasonable suspicion" justifies only a limited frisk for weapons to protect the safety of the officer.

The bill is fatally deficient under the Constitution in a second, equally fundamental way. The Fourth Amendment has two parts: first it requires a warrant based upon probable cause, but second it also requires that the warrant "particularly" described the place to be searched, and the person or things to be seized. It was the use of so-called "general warrants" in connection with seditious libel prosecutions in England and the similar "Writs of Assistance" directed against rebellious Americans to enforce the Crown's tax laws in Colonial America which prompted the Fourth Amendment.

The ACLU believes that all wiretapping

* This short review of the history of wiretapping is based on an article appearing in Congressional Quarterly, Vol. XXXI No. 34, pp. 2321-24 (8/25/73).

violates the Fourth Amendment's particularity requirement. However, even if you look only at the degree of particularity of this bill, it is far and away less particular than even the existing federal criminal wiretap statute which we opposed for the same reason.

For a criminal tap, the court must find probable cause to believe:

- (1) that a crime has been, is being or is about to be committed by the target of the tap;
- (2) that the facilities to be tapped belong to or are likely to be used by the target;
- (3) that the conversations to be intercepted will pertain to the alleged offense; and
- (4) that other less intrusive investigative techniques have been tried and failed.

Under S. 3197 the court must only satisfy itself that the target of the surveillance is an agent of a foreign power and that the facilities tapped will likely be used by such person. The court is without authority to question the government's assertion that information pertaining to foreign intelligence will be obtained.

Under S. 3197 the Attorney General merely certifies that his purpose is to obtain foreign intelligence information; the court is without authority to inquire what basis, if any, there is for this certification. The court is equally without authority to enforce the requirement that other investigative techniques have proven unsuccessful.

There is a third reason why the ACLU has opposed this legislation. Even with the limited restrictions that this bill places on the executive's ability to wiretap, the Department of Justice has insisted nevertheless that there be a section of the bill leaving room for an executive claim of "inherent constitutional authority" to disregard the bill's limitations if a sufficiently serious situation should ever arise. This "inherent authority" provision also leaves unregulated the practices of the National Security Agency—the supersecret agency that regularly intercepts overseas telephone calls and which in its other activities may pose the most serious threat to civil liberties. Therefore NSA's so-called Shamrock program, involving the theft of millions of international telegrams, and the watch list program would not be restricted by the bill.

The Church Committee was unequivocal in its treatment of claims of inherent executive authority. In its first two recommendations—those it felt of primary importance—it flatly denied the existence of any such power and condemned the pernicious effect, governmental lawlessness, that such a doctrine embraced. Yet, S. 3197 implicitly recognizes the possibility of the executive's power to ignore the law in the name of national security—a doctrine that should be resoundingly denounced rather than accepted through a stance of passive neutrality. There can be little doubt that this supposedly neutral provision will show up in Justice Department briefs as further evidence of the existence of presidential power to go beyond the law.

The struggle that S. 3197 represents between the need to adequately protect national security yet protect as well the liberty that this nation represents is hardly novel. In May of 1798, less than a decade after the adoption of the Constitution, two of the founding fathers exchanged views on this problem that would challenge the government they had created for the next two centuries. James Madison wrote to Thomas Jefferson:

"Perhaps it is a universal truth that the loss of liberty at home is to be charged to provisions against danger real or pretended from abroad."

One month after that letter was written,

Congress enacted the infamous Alien and Sedition Acts, to protect infant America from European subversion.

The Alien and Sedition Acts were not reenacted and passed into history within a short time after their passage, but they set a dangerous precedent for political repression in the name of national security. That precedent was repeated during the Civil War when Lincoln suspended the Writ of Habeas Corpus; during World War I and later in the Red Scare of the 1920's when "radicals" were persecuted by the federal government; and during World War II when the federal government incarcerated 120,000 Japanese-Americans in detention camps. Perhaps the most dangerous and threatening descendant of the Alien and Sedition Acts is the 40 year domestic intelligence program of the FBI that was so carefully documented by the Church Committee in their final report.

In every one of these cases, Congresses, Presidents and the American People were seduced by the argument that subversion of our Bill of Rights was essential to protect the government from foreign subversion. This bill perpetuates two basic elements of that argument. 1) that limiting investigations to criminal activity is unworkable and 2) that it is necessary for the executive branch, through inherent authority to act above the law.

Our founding fathers were familiar with those arguments; they knew the answer. They would answer with William Pitt, the famous English statesman of their age, who resisted similar arguments by the Crown on the floor of parliament:

"Necessity is the plea for every infringement of human liberty. It is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves."

ECONOMIC FICTION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate in this Nation continues its upward climb. It has reached the 7.9 percent level with rates two and three times that among minorities and youths, and we are told by the administration that the previous predictions of a reduction in unemployment to 7 percent by the end of the year are now no longer applicable. In the meantime, behind the statistics remains the misery and loss of dignity which accompany the tragedy of unemployment.

It is particularly sad, as the following editorial points out, that the arguments so readily utilized by the Republicans to defend their policies have now been disavowed by administration sources themselves. Since 1969, when the Republicans came to power, unemployment has risen from 3.5 percent of the work force, up to 8.9 percent, and now "down" to 7.9 percent. The rationale for causing so much suffering has been that reduction of the unemployment rate inevitably produces inflation.

It is this piece of supposedly irrefutable logic that Mr. Gus Tyler, a noted political analyst addresses in the following article. As one of the Nation's foremost experts in the field of politics and the organized labor movement, Mr. Tyler is

in a unique position to offer his comments on this issue.

I insert his editorial for my colleagues, attention below:

[From the AFL-CIO News, Aug. 21, 1976]

FORD'S OWN WORDS CONFUND HIS "ANTI-INFLATION" RATIONALE

(By Gus Tyler)

The justification for seven years of needless suffering in our country has just been declared "inoperative" by a casual sentence in a dull government report—some dozen words that have gone unnoticed and unnoticed. Yet by this simple statement, the whole rationale for pushing America into an economic ditch has been officially declared to be nonsense.

The document is—of all things—the Economic Report for 1976 authored by none other than the President. On page four is the simple declaration that "inflation and unemployment are not opposites but related symptoms of an unhealthy economy."

Repeat: "Inflation and unemployment are not opposites."

But for seven years, Nixon and Ford told us that they were opposites and, therefore, the antidote for inflation was unemployment. This cruel credo was given theological probity by reference to the Phillips Curve theory.

By this theory, unemployment and inflation were at opposite ends of a see-saw. When unemployment was down, inflation was up; when unemployment was up, inflation was down. By this logic, Nixon encouraged unemployment (send it up) to fight inflation (bring it down). The euphemism for this massacre on people was "cooling the economy."

Sacrificed on the altar of the Phillips myth were millions of families as men and women lost jobs, home, health, and self-respect. Sacrificed were the near-poor who were now tossed into the pit of official poverty—forced to live on a handout. Sacrificed were folk in counties, cities, and towns that were reduced to humiliating and inadequate beggary. Sacrificed were tens of thousands of small businesses that collapsed with the weakening economy.

Some of us were outraged at this inhuman sacrifice of humans in the name of an economic fiction that had no basis in fact, no logic in theory. We protested against this senseless worship at the altar of a fake god.

But to the defense of this deceitful deity came the high priests of "academic economics." They referred to the seminal study of Phillips, overwhelming readers with "op. cit.," "ibid.," "ibids.," and arcane abracadabra—without ever having read Phillips, who never said that unemployment and inflation were opposites. (All he did say was that in times of high employment, wages—not necessarily prices—tend to rise.)

Had these yea-sayers of one another consulted the facts they would have noted that in the years from 1947 to 1953 unemployment went down steadily, so that in the last year of that period the jobless count was under 3 percent while "inflation" was under 1 percent.

On the contrary, in the Eisenhower years after 1953, the jobless rate rose from under 3 percent in 1953 to 6.7 percent in 1960, while prices, for the same period, multiplied two and a half times over.

In my recent book—"Scarcity: A Critique of the American Economy"—I said that our recession is not the cure for but the cause of our inflation. The certified savants listened and smiled that supercilious scorn they reserve for the uncertified illiterates.

Now what will they do in the face of the President's pronouncement that they have been wrong all the time? My guess is that they will not review their error nor revise their texts. They will proceed with their vested preachment to gather more human sacrifices for an insatiable barbaric god.

Such is the primitive ritual among some of our most learned in these civilized times.

POLICY QUESTIONS REGARDING TELECOMMUNICATION SYSTEM

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, this Nation faces some basic public policy questions regarding our telecommunications policy which only the Congress can answer. More than a quarter of my colleagues have expressed concern over this issue by sponsoring the Consumer Communications Reform Act of 1976. I am not a sponsor of this legislation. However, I am concerned that our Nation's telecommunications industry may be moving in a direction that ultimately might run counter to the public interest, and I feel Congress must examine this proposed legislation and the arguments of its opponents in order to determine what policy is in the public interest.

We have in this country an unparalleled communications system. It operates efficiently and plays an essential part in the daily social, economic, political, and educational life of our country. In the sort of information-based society in which we live, a rapid, economical, efficient communications system is essential. I know that I need not point out the critical role of communications in military, civic, or natural disasters.

The telephone industry, operating as a monopoly regulated by State and Federal authorities, has turned in a good performance for this Nation. It has broadly extended its service so that today 97 percent of our households have telephone service, and this service has remained relatively economical despite inflation.

On the other hand, we know the benefits that competition confers in most areas of the economy. We know that it generally brings more choices to consumers; it can also mean lower prices and in most instances increased productivity and innovation. We also know that technology in the communications field will be growing at a geometric rate in the near future, so much so that a sole supplier of telecommunications may not be in the public interest.

Competition many years ago was unworkable for the telecommunications industry for a variety of reasons. Local communities were ill-served by several telephone companies operating in the same geographic areas; costs were high; duplication of poles and lines was evidently wasteful; service was spotty. At the same time, there was a lack of cooperation by all concerned to connect with independent companies.

As a result, at both the State and Federal level, the telephone industry came to be regarded as one where the consumer benefited more from a single supplier than from any competing suppliers. Rightly or wrongly, the curb of regulation was imposed to substitute for the spur of competition—to regulate profits and prices and to assure that service needs were met.

This opinion on the benefits of a regulated monopoly for the telecommunications industry held sway, for all intents and purposes, until the latter part of the 1960's. At that time, there was a growing question in the minds of some regulators, particularly among Federal regulators, as to whether or not the telephone company's monopoly was, in fact, too inclusive and too broad—particularly in light of changing times and changing technology.

The impetus for increased interest in the role of competition in telecommunications came from the FCC decision in the now famous Carterfone 1968 case which permitted, with restrictions, the connection of privately owned equipment to the telephone network. Its decision was based on the philosophy that the consumer could use the telephone network in a manner that was "privately beneficial but not publicly detrimental."

In the ensuing years, the FCC began new applications of this doctrine. It has since opened up to other carriers various types of so-called specialized markets such as private line microwave services for business and domestic satellite services.

The justification for these decisions is the Commission's belief that, in certain parts of the telecommunications market, competition will yield its usual benefits without disturbing the known benefits that the country has enjoyed from regulated monopoly.

The telephone industry has continually raised alarms about the course the Commission has been pursuing. While the views of the Federal Communications Commission cannot be dismissed lightly, neither, it seems to me, can the position of the members of the telephone industry. They, after all, have been the ones most directly responsible for the quality of service we do enjoy in this country.

Their position is that the regulatory policies of the FCC, while appearing to be confined to discreet parts of the market will, in fact, create a rippling effect throughout their service—disturbing both its quality and its price.

The telephone industry claims that injections of competitive offerings will require the telephone companies to abandon the pricing principles that they contend have enabled them to keep the price of telephone service for the home user low. The principle that the telephone industry contends it has followed thus far, at the direction of Federal and State regulators, has been to subsidize residential telephone service through profits from other telecommunications services. This, they argue, has brought about the best telephone service in the world at a reasonable cost. Under the present policies of the FCC, they see themselves compelled to price many of their services closer to costs in order to compete. This, they say, will transfer many of the common costs of their operation from business users to the shoulders of the home ratepayer. In addition, they warn that operating something as complex as the nationwide switched network connecting some 148 million telephones is best done by tele-

phone companies working in concert, rather than by multiple suppliers with competing interests.

They also contend that duplication of facilities will prove wasteful and will tend to disperse the volumes of traffic they need to justify the introduction of great cost-saving technology.

Industry opponents of the Consumer Communications Reform Act of 1976 argue that a variety of new communications services have been introduced that may not have been introduced by A.T. & T. without competition in the telephone industry. They further assert that the telephone industry argument of sharply increasing residential rates is an extreme example that assumes a total loss of A.T. & T. interstate service and terminal equipment revenue without any reduction in costs. The Ad Hoc Committee for Competitive Telecommunications asserts that only 3 percent of A.T. & T.'s market is subject to direct competition.

In hearing the views of the FCC on the one hand indicating that their policies will prove beneficial, and on the other hand, listening to the members of the telephone industry sounding warning alarms, I can only conclude that this important issue must be clarified and decided.

Clearly, no one in this Congress wants to see actions by the Federal Communications Commission result in a less innovative telecommunications system.

Nor are many of us inclined to favor an exception to our competitive free enterprise system unless there is overwhelming evidence that such an exception is justified.

Rather than cast this issue in academic economic schools of thought—monopoly versus competition—I believe that we have to drive it down to the basic issue. That is, what course of action is in the best interest of the public.

Certainly, it is not the job or the responsibility of Congress to tinker with the detailed rates of the telephone industry. However, the broad impact of telephone rates is more than an industry question. It concerns the affordability of a basic service to all the people. It concerns the broad social question of who should bear the cost of a nationwide telecommunications policy, and whose interests should be protected. It also concerns whether the telephone industry should be responsible for a subsidization of local service or whether such an activity could be more effectively administered by a Government agency.

So, while I have not sponsored the Consumer Communications Reform Act of 1976, I add my support to the idea that here is a multiplicity of questions that deserve thorough airing before the Congress.

I commend Chairman VAN DERLIN of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Communications for having indicated that he will hold exploratory hearings to clarify the issues. Chairman VAN DERLIN has perceived very clearly the inherent dangers in continuing the present competitive policies in the telecommunications field without first determining whether or not in fact

this policy is in the best interest of the public. Frankly, I do not know the answer. I am hopeful that my colleagues will closely follow this issue.

I heartily agree with Chairman VAN DERLIN that these exploratory hearings should be held, and I hope that they will pave the way for full hearings on the issues in which all arguments can be examined, data sifted, and the public interest discerned.

I wish to emphasize that the broad question of public policy must be answered in a reasonable period of time by the Congress. This is one hot potato we should not and cannot pass on to the FCC or anybody else.

FARMING CHANGES WOULD ASTOUND FOREFATHERS

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, just recently, I had the opportunity to read an interesting article in the Delta Farm Press which pointed out some of the changes that have taken place in agriculture during this great Nation's 200 years of existence.

This type of article is certainly appropriate during this year of our Bicentennial especially when one considers that we began as a predominantly rural nation where about 75 percent of the population was either directly or indirectly associated with agricultural pursuits. That is an astounding ratio of the early American population when we consider that only 5 percent of our people today produce all of the food fiber needed in this country and still have enough surplus to supply a great many foreign governments with their needs.

I want to take this opportunity to share this article with my colleagues in the House by inserting it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FARMING CHANGES WOULD ASTOUND FOREFATHERS

(By Cecil Williams, Jr.)

WEST MEMPHIS, ARK.—If jolly old Ben Franklin were looking in on America during this Bicentennial Year, he might be surprised enough to lose his bifocals (a Franklin invention).

Because Franklin was so interested in farming, he and some of the other founding fathers would be likely to observe that agriculture has changed as much as any other element of American life.

Even with his brilliant mind, Franklin could never have guessed what farming would be like in 1976. In his day, for example, the colonists fed and cared for a rooster for six months to grow it to eating size. Now, Arkansas broiler producers grow a four-pound chicken in about nine weeks.

NUMEROUS CHANGES

Mechanization, modern chemical use, much larger farms, and new crops are a few other examples of changes that might hit Franklin harder than the lightning that trickled down his kite string.

The early farmers never heard of soybeans, for instance, and now they're one of the biggest crops in the United States.

In Arkansas, soybeans are the number one cash crop—yet, the most expert of America's early farm leaders might not be able to identify them in the field today.

Those early farmers did know about cotton, but not on the scale found in the U.S. in the 20th Century.

If Ben Franklin and Thomas Jefferson could see cotton today in Arkansas, even in a poor crop year, they'd probably find it hard to believe. In their time, small plots produced a few bundles of raw fiber for yarn and fabric, but it took the whole family to remove the seeds, spin the yarn, and slowly weave the cotton.

FINISHED PRODUCTS

In a good year, a typical Arkansas acre of cotton will grow about a bale, or 480 pounds, and from that acre may be produced 540 men's shirts, 610 women's dresses, or 1,100 bath towels.

That same acre can be stretched into more garments by shifting the cotton into bikinis; it would produce 2,640 of the skimpy swimsuits.

But not all of our founding fathers would be happy with today's farming industries, perhaps, because some of their favorite methods are rapidly fading away.

Thomas Jefferson, for example, invented a plow that was later named for him. But the plow may soon be going the way of the old gray mare, according to the Soil Conservation Service.

A recent SCS report said the time-honored plow may be a museum piece in a few years, because many farmers now are adopting minimum tillage practices.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

Minimum tillage methods leave crop residues on the land just beneath the soil surface to hold soil in place and conserve moisture. Less energy is needed under the system, too, and tillage costs are reduced.

Although not all land is suited to that method, SCS says there are now 36 million U.S. acres farmed without the traditional moldboard plow that turns soil upside down as land preparation begins in the spring.

Probably the biggest change in farming has been the substitution of machines for manpower, and the greatly increased efficiency they allow.

In Ben Franklin's time, about three-fourths of our population were needed just to produce enough food and fiber for the struggling new nation. Today, about five percent of our people can produce all the food and fiber needed at home and still have enough left over to supply hundreds of foreign countries.

BEST FARM PRODUCTS

Under the American system—and we can credit Franklin and Jefferson with great wisdom and foresight here—our people have the best and least expensive farm products anywhere in the world.

Other countries are still in the 1700's as far as their farming industries are concerned.

In Russia, for example, it still takes half the population to grow enough food and fiber, and they're still doing it the hard way.

Maybe old Ben wouldn't be so surprised at the farming changes after all—he always said freedom would change the world.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, because I was absent from the

Chamber, I missed some rollcall votes on August 10.

Had I been present and voting, I would have voted in the following manner.

"Yea" on rollcall No. 630.

"Yea" on rollcall No. 631.

"Yea" on rollcall No. 632.

"Yea" on rollcall No. 633.

"Yea" on rollcall No. 634.

"Yea" on rollcall No. 635.

"Yea" on rollcall No. 637.

TROTSKYISM AND TERRORISM: PART VIII—TERRORIST ACTIVITIES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Fourth International supports terrorism in the Middle East as a weapon for the eventual creation of an Arab Communist state stretching from North Africa to Pakistan. As an initial step toward that goal, the Fourth International supports Palestinian terrorists and the destruction of the State of Israel.

This policy was described in an article signed by "Jaber," a member of the International Executive Committee from Lebanon; "Sami," of Iraq; and Gerard Vergeat, an alternate member of the IEC who is assigned to work for the Fourth International Bureau, the apparatus for day-to-day operations.

The article revealed the Fourth International position in support of the "complete and unconditional right of the Palestinian Arab people to self-determination; that is, their right to reclaim all the territory from which they have been expelled.

The article states:

The exercise of this right presupposes the destruction of the Zionist state . . . this solution cannot be envisaged outside the context of a revolutionary overturn in the entire Near East, which alone can provide the forces necessary to liberate Palestine from the Zionist and imperialist grip. That is, the destruction of the Israeli state goes hand in hand with the abolition of the other Arab states, on the road to creating a united Arab state.²

The Israeli section of the Fourth International is called the Revolutionary Communist League, also known as Matzpen-Marxist. Its leader is Michel Warshawsky who serves on the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International under the alias "Mikado."³

In an article in the official Fourth International magazine, Inprecor, Warshawsky boasted of the role of his organization during recent rioting by Arab students in the Israeli-occupied West Bank area. We wrote:

The response to the RCL's activity, amplified by a press campaign after the arrest of some of its militants, has strongly increased the esteem for and audience of the revolutionary Marxists among the Palestinian population. For the first time, the RCL appeared not as an organization of anti-

Footnotes at end of article.

Zionist Jews in solidarity with the struggle of the Palestinians, but as an organization that is an integral part of the struggle of this Palestinian population and is implanted among it.⁴

The Revolutionary Communist Group, led by S. Jaber, operates as the Lebanese section of the Fourth International. They actively participated in the 1975-1976 civil war in support of the Palestinian-Lebanese Left coalition. Jaber wrote in "Inprecor": "Militarily, the RCG participated in the fighting in the anti-reactionary camp." He went on to say "the RCG chose to participate essentially in the task of defending the popular neighborhoods. It took charge of some of the advanced defense posts."⁵

Both the Israeli and Lebanese sections of the Fourth International pretend that they are only sympathizers, rather than members of the Fourth International. In a letter signed "Mikado" and "Jaber" addressed to the 10th World Congress of the Fourth International held in Sweden in February 1974, they asked that their groups be recognized as sections of the International. However, they asked that "for political as well as security problems, we are asking to be identified only as sympathizing groups in the organs of sections and groups of the International."⁶

On August 3, 1975, the Cairo newspaper Al-Akhbar, reported that the Egyptian Government had arrested several revolutionaries. The report stated:

The State Security Investigation Department has arrested members of a communist organization which has links with communist organizations in Lebanon and France. Some 20 members of the organization, including five women, have been detained. The communist organization called itself the "International Communist League," whose objective is to overthrow the political economic systems in the country and to impose the extremist communist "Trotskyite" system.

The security authorities have been following the organization's activity since August 1974 and its members were arrested last July. The communist organization has links with the revolutionary communist amalgamation in Lebanon and the Fourth International, which is an extremist communist group in France.

According to Intercontinental Press, a total of 20 Trotskyites had been arrested on July 3, 1975. The Egyptian Government had accused them of connections with the Fourth International section in Lebanon from which they had received funds and literature. Intercontinental Press reported on July 19, 1976, that the remaining five Trotskyists had been released from prison in Egypt.

The Socialist Workers Party, U.S.A. has been active in support of Middle East terrorist movements. SWP National Committee member Tony Thomas has explained the use of anti-Zionism as a cover for the Trotskyite desire to overthrow all of the existing Middle East governments. He wrote:

It must be remembered the limitations of organizing rights in all of the Arab countries. In fact until the early spring or late winter of this year Palestinians had more organizing rights and less danger of total victimization than radicals in Egypt or Syria. By centering on the demands against Israeli-occu-

pation of Palestine and against imperialist domination, revolutionists can make it more difficult for repression to strike them, or when it strikes make it less advantageous for the Arab capitalists and their imperialist backers.

This type of strategy, in summary, will make it more possible to add to the already massive nationalist consciousness of the Palestinian and Arab peoples the most important type of class consciousness—consciousness of the fact that the ruling capitalists cannot grant the major demands they raise. This will be the basis of a mass movement of the Arab revolution and a mass revolutionary party.⁸

The SWP even opposed American arms shipments to the Arab states claiming that such aid really benefits Israel. He wrote:

As we know, a third corollary of the theory of permanent revolution is that socialism cannot be completed in one country and that the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be assured of safety from imperialist intervention or bureaucratic degeneration, until revolutions are successful in the capitalist countries. This is again another reason why the main axis of the Palestinian and Arab revolutions must be centered on struggle against imperialism and Zionism. This is why our central task must be mobilizing and educating the people of the U.S. and other advanced capitalist countries to support the Arab revolution and to oppose U.S. support to Israel, including in the form of aid to Arab states.⁹

The use of anti-Zionism as a cover for the real Trotskyite goal was also explained by Denis Hoppe of the East Lansing, Mich. local of the Young Socialist Alliance, the SWP youth group. Hoppe was describing relationships between YSA and the Organization of Arab Students. Some of the Arab students were Stalinist-oriented—that is, pro-Russian or pro-Red Chinese—others supported their own governments. Hoppe wrote:

The YSA must be careful in dealing with these organizations to make it clear that we do not want them to be restrictive. They are most effective and active when they do not limit political discussion to only one point of view. That is why we must reserve our specific revolutionary analysis of the Middle East to our internal relations with OAS. At public forums with OAS, we should limit our comments to the defense of the Arab revolution against Zionism and imperialism. The OAS is critical of the YSA for speaking about the evils of Stalinism at public forums on the Middle East. Furthermore, since many members of the OAS are outright supporters of the countries and regimes who sent them to this country on scholarship (Iraq, Libya, etc.) we must be careful to avoid alienating them by excessive criticism of the Arab regimes at events cosponsored with OAS. As I mentioned earlier, the OAS's effectiveness is largely due to the fact that large numbers of Arabs of differing political views can unite around the task to be done in the U.S.: defense of the Palestinian and Arab revolution. Since the YSA agrees with this, we unite with them on that issue. The specific expression of Trotskyist ideas must be reserved to informal discussions. Actually, since the Arab students have seen that the YSA and SWP are the best defenders of the fight against Israel in the U.S., it is they who will come and ask us about our politics to find how we reached our position of the Middle East.¹⁰

AFRICA

The Fourth International has little real influence in Africa, although they

do support Marxist-Leninist terrorist groups trained and armed by the Soviet-bloc operating in Rhodesia, South Africa, and Southwest Africa. The British section of the Fourth International, the International Marxist Group, publishes a magazine called Africa in Struggle to express this support.

I. B. Tabata serves as a "consultant" member of the International Executive Committee using the alias "Tom." Tabata, born in South Africa and long resident in Europe, is the only African member of the IEC.¹¹

FOOTNOTES

¹ International Internal Discussion Bulletin, Vol. XII, No. 1, January 1975, p. 4; Minutes of the November 23-24, 1975, meeting of the United Secretariat, Appendix II, Memorandum to members of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction Steering Committee from Mary-Alice Waters, December 19, 1975.

² International Internal Discussion Bulletin, Vol. X, No. 21, November 1973, p. 22.

³ International Internal Discussion Bulletin, Vol. XII, No. 1, January 1975, p. 4.

⁴ Inprecor, April 29, 1976, p. 27.

⁵ Inprecor, April 1, 1976, p. 20.

⁶ International Internal Discussion Bulletin, Vol. XI, No. 5, April 1974, p. 22.

⁷ Intercontinental Press, September 8, 1975, p. 1163.

⁸ SWP Discussion Bulletin, Vol. 29, No. 6, August 1971, p. 20.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Young Socialist Discussion Bulletin, Vol. XVII, No. 6, December 1974, p. 27.

¹¹ International Internal Discussion Bulletin, Vol. XII, No. 1, January 1975, p. 4.

REPRESENTATIVE NEAL ADDRESSES WISCONSIN BANKERS ON DOMESTIC MONETARY POLICY

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. NEAL) is doing a particularly responsible and energetic job as chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy of the House Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing. Because his remarks before the Graduate School of Banking, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., sponsored by the Central States Conference of Bankers Associations in August 25, 1976, go to the heart of monetary policy, I commend them to Members:

RECENT U.S. MONETARY POLICY

(An Address by the Honorable STEPHEN L. NEAL, Chairman, Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy)

Last week you heard a panel of four Federal Reserve bank presidents discuss monetary policy. Now you are going to hear one Congressman's view on the same subjects.

One Congressman can't speak with four voices. And, if he could, he couldn't do justice to the several views on monetary policy currently enshrined, if not enshrined, in Congressional thinking. But though I can't possibly cover the full range of views, I'm going to try to present those that make the most sense.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

Congress doesn't make monetary policy. Monetary policy in the United States is made and executed by the Federal Reserve System's Board of Governors and Reserve bank presidents. It has been that way since 1914, and it is likely to stay that way for a long time to come. Though there are strongly held views in the Congress on monetary policy, there is little sentiment for politicizing it, even among the Fed's most vociferous critics. On the other hand, there now is widespread bi-partisan support for Congress to routinely oversee what the Fed is doing, and to bring its plans and actions out into the sunshine. This sentiment emerged with passage of House Concurrent Resolution 133 a year ago last March, and it has grown stronger ever since.

Under the Resolution, the Fed updates and discloses its money growth targets for the coming 12 months four times a year. There have been two important benefits from this procedure:

One is that it compelled the Fed to think a year ahead four times a year. Given the Fed's traditional preoccupation with the next few weeks, this was no mean achievement. Second, there is a special benefit from disclosure per se. It has acted as a discipline, preventing prolongation of both excessively rapid and excessively slow money growth. But, make no mistake, close and continuing Congressional vigilance is required to make certain that these benefits continue to accrue.

As Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy, I share responsibility for overseeing what the Fed is doing with my distinguished colleague and friend from Milwaukee, Congressman Henry Reuss, and Wisconsin's equally distinguished senior Senator, Bill Proxmire. To better carry out the oversight responsibility, when I became Chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy last spring, I asked the staff to assemble the data on the historical relationships between monetary policy and economic performance. Since then, my staff has quantified some extremely interesting relationships and identified costly past mistakes. In pursuing this research, our purpose was to learn, not to condemn. We can achieve a stable and growing economy only if we study and learn from the past. Staff research is an essential tool in performing the monetary policy oversight function. With the results of our research in hand, current policy can be discussed objectively and effectively.

SOME BASIC RESEARCH DECISIONS

We chose money supply growth rather than interest rate changes to measure the thrust of monetary policy. As compared to interest rate changes, money supply growth is a most reliable thermometer. Consider what happens in booms. As the economy expands and inflation heats up, interest rates will tend to rise whether the Fed acts to tighten credit or not. Interest rate increases thus are not a reliable indicator of a tighter Federal Reserve policy. Slower money growth is. It is because money growth slows in booms only if the Fed acts to slow it.

Among the alternative money supply measures, we chose M-1, which is the conventional definition and consists of publicly held coin, currency and checking deposits. We use M-1 to indicate the thrust of the Fed's money policy because, since 1960, its GNP velocity or turnover has fluctuated less around its trend than the velocities of M-2 and other money supply measures have fluctuated around their trends.

Now as Al Smith said, "Let's look at the record."

THE MONEY SUPPLY ROLLER COASTER

Throughout the post World War II period, money supply has moved up and down like

a roller coaster. Exhibit 1 shows the pattern since the Korean War. It graphs the yearly percentage growth in M-1 from 1953 to the present. Each point gives the percentage change in M-1 between the same months from one year to the next. The first point on the left gives the percentage growth between January 1953 and January 1954; the second point between February 1953 and February 1954; and so forth. The exhibit clearly shows that the growth of our M-1 money supply from 1953 to 1976 has followed a roller-coaster pattern. Furthermore, since 1965 the money supply roller coaster has been tilted sharply upward.

Some would argue that money supply rolled with the economy. Up because the economy moved up, down because the economy dipped. Our economy's cycles, this argument goes, caused the money supply cycles. The argument contains a grain of truth. This is because in past years, the Fed has accommodated money growth to the economy's growth. As Ohio State Professor William Dewald has said, "Monetary growth rates have been above average during booms and below average after booms peak out and recessions develop, just the opposite of what common sense would suggest." But, there is no excuse for this behavior.

The point is that ours is a managed money supply. In managed money supply systems, there can be no chain of causation that runs from the economy to money growth unless the managers want one. The Federal Reserve has ample powers to control money growth. To accelerate money growth, the Fed can increase its open market purchases of Treasury securities, reduce discount rates and lower reserve requirement ratios. If one degree of policy change doesn't work, the Fed need only try harder. Some degree of open market purchases and (or) reductions in discount rates and reserve requirements will do the trick. Vice versa, some degree of open market sales and (or) increases in discount rates and reserve requirements would slow money growth if desired.

At hearings of my Subcommittee this past June, (pointing to the exhibit of the money supply roller coaster) I asked Federal Reserve Board Governor Charles Partee, "could the Fed have kept the growth of money supply on a more even keel if it so desired?"

Governor Partee answered, "Yes. It could have been done; that is, in abstraction."

In summary, the Federal Reserve, not the economy, controls the pattern of money growth. The Fed may choose to accommodate and reinforce an economic trend. But it doesn't have to do so. The roller-coaster pattern of money supply growth shown in Exhibit 1 need not have occurred. Whether it helped or hurt our economy is a separate question to which I now turn.

IMPACT OF THE MONEY SUPPLY ROLLER COASTER

The fundamental tenets of monetary economics are: (1) prolonged, excessively rapid growth of money supply generates (or accommodates) inflation; and (2) sharp prolonged deceleration in money growth produces and exacerbates recession tendencies. If shown Exhibit 1, a Rip Van Winkle monetary economist, who went to sleep in 1953 and awakened only today, would make two bets. First, he would bet that we suffered recessions in the months surrounding the bottoming of money growth in 1954, 1957, 1960, 1967, 1970, and 1975; and second, he would bet that inflation occurred in two waves after 1964.

History demonstrates that if there were any takers, he would win his bets. The tenets of monetary economics are not just esoteric academic theories. They have been operational throughout the post-1953 period. As Dr. Jerry L. Jordan, of the Pittsburgh National Bank, remarked in testimony before my Subcommittee:

"The basic relationships are that the fluctuations in the growth of money supply are

related to fluctuations in unemployment, and the trend growth in money supply determines the trend in prices or inflation.

"... If you maintain high growth in money, ... you will raise the trend of inflation."

RECESSIONS

Let me go over this ground briefly. Exhibit 2 marks off the post-1954 recessions. From 1953 to 1965 we experienced recessions in 1953-1954 (not marked off), 1957-1958, and 1960-1961. Each episode followed a sharp prolonged slowdown in money growth. But because the trend in money growth stayed close to the economy's long-term 3-4 percent output growth potential, we experienced little inflation from 1953 to 1965.

In the period since 1965, we experienced recessions in 1969-1970 and 1973-1975, and a mini-recession in 1966-1967. As our exhibits show, each of these later episodes also followed a sharp prolonged drop in money growth. But, in this period, because the trend of money growth was tilted upward, and was substantially greater than our 3-4 percent output potential, the recessions were imposed on waves of inflation.

INFLATION

Now let's look at the relationship of inflation to money supply. Exhibit 3 overlays yearly percentage changes in the consumer price index (delayed 23 months) on the other exhibits. The reason for the delay in mapping inflation is that in the period since the Korean War, the immediate or concurrent relationship between inflation and money supply growth has been insignificant. Since World War II, the growth and lengthening of contractual wage and price relationships and the increased costs of posting price changes, have lengthened the time it takes for money supply changes to affect prices. Additionally, because of our commitments to maximum employment under the 1946 Employment Act, sellers now seldom change pricing policies when sales fall, as they know they can expect prompt, vigorous anti-recession Government actions.

We found that a 23-month lag reflects better than any other single lag (2 months, 12 months, 22 months, 24 months, etc.) the average effects of increased or decreased money supply on inflation. This does not mean that the effects on inflation occur suddenly, in lock-step, 23 months after money growth is changed. It means only that the effects of money growth on inflation are best displayed if inflation is mapped 23 months after money growth. Stated otherwise, if you want to see the effects of money supply changes on inflation, you get a pretty good indication by looking at what happens to inflation 23 months after money supply changes.

Looking at the overlay of inflation on money growth, you can see the inflation rate is tracked pretty well by money growth occurring 23 months earlier. On average, 60 percent of year to year inflation is explained by money growth 23 months ago.

More complicated computer analyses were used to check the money supply-inflation relationship. Quarterly data gave the same result as the monthly data displayed in the exhibits. The same result also was obtained when we used only one observation for each year. This latter experiment showed, moreover, that the close mapping of inflation on earlier money growth displayed in our exhibits is no mere reflection of common trend.

To check further, we used more complicated lag structures. For example, we related the inflation rate in the latest year to money growth that year, and simultaneously, one, two and three years earlier. Peak power occurred at 2 years and the fit of inflation to money growth increased to 78 percent. Other tests revealed no difference in money's power

to affect inflation whether distributed 1 and 2 years ago, 18 months and 2½ years ago, or 2 and 3 years ago. In summary, these and other tests indicate that, allowing for the absorption of a part of money growth in increased production, changes in U.S. money growth generate proportional changes in our inflation rate about 2 years later.

MONEY AND INFLATION IN ENGLAND

Recent English experience is remarkably like ours. This is revealed in an article in the July 13 *London Times* by Mr. William Rees-Mogg. Using a different methodology, he found that excess M-3 money supply accounts for all of England's inflation since 1967. He concluded:

"Excess money supply is like water flowing from a tap attached to a hosepipe which is about two years in length. Once you have turned the tap on nothing will stop the water coming out at the other end of the hosepipe in the form of price increases. Therefore the essential matter is to see that the tap is not turned on."

Do not be a doubting Thomas because Rees-Mogg uses M-3 and we use M-1. In the United States, at least, all M's are very close traveling companions, their growth rates rising and falling very much together. In terms of M-1, in the United States, money must grow about 3 percent per year to absorb production increases. Excess growth brings inflation. It's as simple as that.

The relationship has wide historical application. Inflation always followed in the wake of new discoveries of gold when gold was used as money. It tapered off and recessions occurred when gold became scarce. Experience has not been different under paper money, except that since World War II, for reasons I indicated earlier, the lag from excess money growth to increased inflation appears to have lengthened by 1 to 2 years.

OTHER FACTORS

Let me inject a caveat at this point. Our work does not indicate that U.S. inflation, year to year, is solely and completely a money supply phenomenon. Our research demands that we conclude that increases and decreases in money growth cause increases and decreases in the rate of inflation about two years later; it does not follow that prices cannot rise as a result of other factors.

My Subcommittee staff looked into the parts played in our post-1953 inflation experience by economywide production changes, the overall unemployment rate, government deficits and import prices. Here are the major results.

1. Production increases absorb part of money growth and restrain its inflation impact.

2. The magnitude of current inflation is not related, at least in any simple way, to the unemployment rate.

3. The deficit is not nearly as significant an inflationary force as money growth. Estimated by itself, it is. But when the inflationary impact of deficits is estimated together with that of money growth and production, it is relatively weak. For the record, following suggestions made by staff of the Federal Reserve Board, we tested for the effects of the deficit using the so-called "high employment" deficit scaled by potential GNP. It just didn't work very well. But let me stress that our failure to find that the deficit is a significant inflationary factor in no way argues for increased government spending. Government spending, in the abstract, is without merit. Only particular programs can possibly merit support, and each should be examined on its own with an open but critical mind. On the other hand, we could be less fearful of decreasing taxes.

In regard to the impact of import prices on inflation, our research confirms what I am sure is common knowledge. Increases in import prices added significantly to rising consumer prices from late 1973 to early 1975.

Import prices began to rise sharply after the second devaluation of the dollar in February 1973. By the third quarter of 1973, rising import prices were adding slightly more than 2 percent to the annual rate of rise in U.S. consumer prices. OPEC's thunderbolt propelled the effect above 3 percent in the fourth quarter of 1973, and to more than 5 percent in the second and third quarters of 1974. The effect dropped under 5 percent by the end of 1974, and then fell rapidly back to zero by the end of 1975. In summary, when our cost of living soared by 12 percent in 1974, 4 to 5 percent was due to rising import prices. The bulk of the remaining 7 to 8 percent was rooted in domestic money growth.

WHY THINGS CAN GO BADLY

Why has the Federal Reserve allowed money supply growth to rise and fall like a roller coaster? The answer is, I believe, intellectual myopia. Like its intellectual parent, the Bank of England, the Federal Reserve traditionally has subordinated money supply growth to interest rate targets. Interest rates are easy to track and monitor hour to hour. And because the Federal Reserve has enough "clout" to dominate the money market at any point in time, it is easy for its officers to flatter themselves into believing that they can control interest rate movements. But when they try, they allow money supply to gyrate more than history shows is prudent. Ironically, moreover, the gyrations in money supply that result from resisting short-run fluctuations in interest rates lead to still wider interest rate swings in the long run.

In inflation, credit demand booms and interest rates rise. Attempts to keep interest rates from rising cause money growth to shoot up rapidly. In turn, the run-up in money growth generates more inflation and still higher interest rates. In recessions, credit demand is slack and interest rates fall. By trying to slow or limit the fall, the Fed undershoots in regard to money supply which aggravates the recession and thereby causes a still greater decline in interest rates. The lesson is clear. Interest rate targets must be subordinated to money supply targets. Not the other way around.

CURRENT POLICY

When I came to the Congress in January 1975, monetary policy was being debated as hotly as in the days of Andrew Jackson or in the period after the Civil War when populism was in full bloom. By allowing money growth to fall from more than 9 percent the year ending January 1973 to less than 2 percent per year after August 1974, the Federal Reserve had committed a major policy blunder. The economy was in a tailspin, and there were no signs that the Fed would reverse course. Chairman Burns was, in fact, telling us that the economy was "awash with liquidity." There was nothing he or his colleagues could do. Nonetheless, we acted.

We passed House Concurrent Resolution 133 expressing the sense of Congress that the Fed promptly reverse course and through the first half of 1975 expand money supply appropriate to facilitating recovery. Looking back, it is pleasing that the Federal Reserve did what the resolution asked, and gratifying that our prescription for recovery appears to have helped.

Beginning in the second half of 1975, the resolution called for money supply to be expanded "commensurate with our economy's long-term potential to increase production, so as to promote effectively the goals of maximum employment, stable prices, and moderate long-term interest rates." In this regard, the Congress rejected the defeatist theory that we can reduce unemployment only by accelerating inflation. In some short-run sense, perhaps a year or two, higher inflation does reduce unemployment. The reason for this is simply that wages and interest rates do not rise as fast as prices in

the early stages of inflation, making it a bargain for business to borrow, invest and hire additional workers. But as time passes, wages and interest rates catch up. When that happens, unemployment rises. Moreover, the more rapid inflation is, the greater the danger that the rise in wages and interest rates will overshoot the rise in prices. If that happens, unemployment will rise above its initial level.

In House Concurrent Resolution 133, Congress recognized that lasting decreases in unemployment could not be achieved by pursuing an inflationary monetary policy. Rather, we registered our sense that we do not have to choose between stable prices and full employment. As a long-run matter, the two are compatible goals which can be promoted by keeping money growth commensurate with our economy's real growth potential. Further, moderate long-term interest rates are a corollary of stable prices. If there were no inflation, interest rates would include no inflationary premiums or add-ons.

So far, the Federal Reserve has followed the resolution's long-run policy prescription, and so far it seems to be working—inflation has tapered off from year ago rates and unemployment also is down. But, in monetary policy matters, as elsewhere, Congress cannot act as if those to whom it has delegated power will always use it responsibly and well.

As Chairman of the House Domestic Monetary Policy Subcommittee, I intend, therefore, to keep a constant watch on what the Fed is doing, and to call Chairman Burns and other Fed officials in to explain in their incipency any deviations above or below the range of money growth which is commensurate with our economy's long-term growth potential. Now, 4½-7 percent annual growth for M-1 appears right. In time, as unemployment falls, the range will have to be lowered.

For sixty-two years, we have allowed men appointed to the Federal Reserve's officialdom to formulate and implement monetary policy without constraints or meaningful guidance, or even fear of being penalized when wrong. The arguments for maintaining this extraordinary degree of independence for persons making public policy to do what they want when they want, are, in the final analysis, mere assertions that in some mysterious way, persons removed from ordinary political processes can be trusted to do the right thing. This view might have a modicum of validity if monetary economics were an exact science and Federal Reserve officials the best practitioners in the country. But these premises are patently false. Monetary policy is no different from defense, foreign, fiscal, health, or any other public policy. It should be subject to the same degree of accountability. I intend to use the Congressional hearings process to make sure that it is.

BUDGET

HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, because I think the 1977 budget outlays as recommended by the Budget Committee in its second budget resolution are somewhat too high in light of improving economic trends, I have asked the committee staff to prepare estimates for the several budget categories of a 2-percent reduction in all nonentitlement programs. The estimates are as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Function	House reported (H. Con. Res. 728)		Estimated reductions (2 percent of nonentitlement appropriations)		Revised totals		Function	House reported (H. Con. Res. 728)		Estimated reductions (2 percent of nonentitlement appropriations)		Revised totals	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays		Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
050 National defense.....	112,086	100,606	-2,300	-2,000	109,786	98,606	550 Health.....	40,527	38,960	-500	-500	40,027	38,460
150 International affairs.....	8,770	6,763	-200	-200	8,570	6,563	600 Income security.....	155,872	137,000	-500	-500	155,372	136,500
250 General science, space, and technology.....	4,595	4,505	-----	-----	4,595	4,505	700 Veterans benefits and services.....	20,323	19,539	-400	-400	19,923	19,139
300 Natural resources, en- vironment, and en- ergy.....	17,923	16,227	-400	-300	17,523	15,927	750 Law enforcement and justice.....	3,490	3,571	-100	-100	3,390	3,471
350 Agriculture.....	2,317	2,239	-----	-----	2,317	2,239	800 General government.....	3,556	3,534	-100	-100	3,456	3,434
400 Commerce and trans- portation.....	17,699	16,984	-400	-300	17,299	16,684	850 Revenue sharing and general purpose fis- cal assistance.....	7,617	7,657	-----	-----	7,617	7,657
450 Community and re- gional development.....	9,584	9,078	-200	-200	9,384	8,878	900 Interest.....	40,400	40,400	-----	-----	40,400	40,400
500 Education, training, employment, and so- cial services.....	23,884	22,187	-500	-400	23,384	21,787	950 Allowances.....	860	910	-----	-----	860	910
							950 Undistributed offset- ting receipts.....	-16,920	-16,920	-----	-----	-16,920	-16,920
							Total.....	452,583	413,240	-5,600	-5,000	446,983	408,240

The total reduction adds up to \$5 billion in outlays and \$5.6 billion in budget authorizations. This would mean a reduction in the estimated deficit for 1977 of \$5 billion from \$50.7 billion to \$45.7, some \$1.8 billion less than the most recent revision of the President's budget.

SURVEY SHOWS WORLD WAR I VETS FEEL THEIR REWARD SMALL

HON. RICHARD KELLY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of my most avid concerns as a Member of Congress has been to see to it that our World War I veterans be duly compensated for their service to the national defense. This particular group of veterans deserves far better treatment than it is currently receiving, and I was encouraged by action taken by the House on June 21 to increase by 25 percent the regular pension rates for veterans aged 80 and over and for their widows. Similarly, the Senate passed legislation on August 4 to grant the 25 percent increase to all World War I veterans and their widows.

I urge the House and Senate conferees on this pension reform legislation to settle their differences as quickly as possible so that our veterans can receive their deserved cost-of-living pension increases by January 1 of next year.

At this time, I insert a poignant article on the World War I veteran that was sent to me by one of my constituents, Herbert Kenyon, of Holiday, Fla. This article deserves the sympathetic attention of all Americans and emphasizes the need for prompt action by both the Congress and the President to insure a better quality of life for our World War I veterans:

[From the St. Petersburg Times,
Aug. 2, 1976]

SURVEY SHOWS VETS OF GREAT WAR FEEL THEIR REWARD IS SMALL

(By Frank De Loache)

American-born Noel Wisdom was 17, patriotic and living in England in 1914 when

World War I began. He enlisted in the British Infantry and in May 1915 was buried with his sergeant in a trench by a shell exploding at the battle of Fromelles.

But he got out of the trench and lived through 46 months of attacks, counterattacks, influenza epidemics, and antipersonnel gas.

For that, he was paid 25 cents a day.

Today Noel Wisdom and a dwindling number of the veterans of the first world war are getting older and find themselves dependent on Social Security Medicare and, if they're lucky, a military pension.

Since the veterans of World War II soon will be applying for their pensions, the Veterans Administration (VA) decided to see what kind of a job it did for the WWI veterans.

Overwhelmingly, the old vets have expressed their dismay with the way their pensions fluctuate and with the increasing costs of medical care. A survey of veterans in Pinellas County in late 1975 and early 1976 showed that 75 per cent are dissatisfied with VA services, and Norma Winston, an instructor at Eckerd College and project supervisor for the survey.

Pinellas County was chosen as the site of the survey because it has one of the largest concentrations of WWI veterans in the country. Ms. Winston said. The survey also provided federal administrators their first look at how most veterans live and how they relate to themselves and others, Ms. Winston said.

The study says that the average veteran is 80, lives with his wife in his own home and visits his adult children regularly. Most of the vets came to Florida within the last 30 years (only 6 per cent have lived in Florida all their lives) and still own and drive a car.

"It was really impressive," Ms. Winston said. "Time and time again the interviewers expressed to me how many of the veterans were 'with it' and had hobbies."

Although many veterans admitted to symptoms of poor health, Ms. Winston said, "They obviously don't think they are sick enough. It's probably a stubbornness. They don't want to be bothered with doctors and tests and pills."

The veterans' independence is reinforced by a strong sense of camaraderie," she added. "They fought for their country and they are proud of it. They provide a tremendous amount of support for each other."

One of the smaller groups of World War I veterans is the 34-member Barracks 3272 at Silver Lake Mobile Resort on 24th Street N. Barracks members Robert Waterbury, 81, Merritt Brown, 79, C. L. Dawson, 78, and Peter Afeld, 84, are all married and have be-

tween them nine children, 26 grandchildren and 17 great-grandchildren.

All the men volunteered for the fighting in Europe when America entered the war in 1917, and all agree that veterans have been forgotten since 1920.

Only Afeld is receiving a VA pension, but all agreed that veterans should be granted a set pension as opposed to the present system of subtracting from their pension every time Social Security benefits or any type of private pension is increased.

(Pensions for veterans are based on the amount of support an individual receives from other sources. As an individual's other sources of income increase, the VA pension is decreased.)

Winston's survey showed only 23 per cent of the veterans are using retirement benefits, and only .1 per cent use education benefits.

The survey also showed that 9.1 per cent of the veterans had monthly incomes of less than \$299, 39 per cent had from \$300 to \$599, 28.6 per cent claimed \$600 or more and 23.3 per cent could not ascertain their monthly income.

Although Eckerd College's report showed many veterans unsatisfied with health care provided at the local VA hospital and clinics, Brown, who has had an operation there said, "There's no better medical service than what you'll get at Bay Pines."

Barracks 3272 members sponsor bingo games for the patients at Bay Pines, while the barracks women's auxiliary often takes cookies and other refreshments to the hospital.

"We don't have a big barracks, but we do a lot more than many of the others," Dawson, the current commander, said. "Of all the World War I veterans I know of, I find that ones who have a definite interest in doing things feel better and live longer."

"There are not too many of us any more. And we are getting on the best we can."

Wisdom, who lives in a small mobile home on 40th Avenue, isn't quite as lucky as the members of Barracks 3272. He fought with the British, although he is an American, and the VA will not give him any financial or medical assistance.

"I get by on Social Security," he said.

The 79-year-old veteran keeps busy reading current books on World War I. He still rides his bike on Sunday ("It's too dangerous any other time"), and likes to watch the Tampa Bay Rowdies and several of the morning game shows on television.

The members of Barracks 3272 and Wisdom are typical of most veterans in the county, Ms. Winston said. They see many of their comrades dying, feel shunned by the government and the public but are determined to cling to their independence and to each other.

And they resent the inducements given volunteers in today's armed forces—high pay, educational benefits and pension plans.

Consequently, the Eckerd College survey recommended that the VA stabilize pensions for the older veterans and improve communications.

"Nothing distresses me more," said Ms. Winston, (than) to see old people who served this country well left out in the cold."

REMARKS BY JIMMY CARTER TO
THE AFL-CIO GENERAL BOARD
MEETING, AUGUST 31, 1976, WASH-
INGTON, D.C.

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the text of a challenging speech delivered by Gov. Jimmy Carter at the AFL-CIO general board meeting held last week in Washington, D.C.

The text of the address follows:

REMARKS BY JIMMY CARTER TO THE AFL-CIO
GENERAL BOARD MEETING—AUGUST 31, 1976

As I come to discuss with you the economic life of our nation, I remember the great contribution of Nat Goldfinger. His public statements and written analyses meant a lot to all of us in public life. He had a wonderful ability to express complicated economic facts and theories in a human and understandable way. He was a tough fighter for working families, and he had common sense. As Lane Kirkland said, Nat Goldfinger was the chief economist of the people.

I am proud to meet here with President George Meany and the other great leaders of the labor movement who have fought so many years for a decent life for working Americans and for a government which is fair and sensitive to the legitimate needs of our people. You were always in the forefront in battles for minimum wage, health care, social security, public education, fairer tax laws, strong national defense, job opportunities, housing and the quiet dignity of free human beings.

Ours is a vision of an America which is strong, united and confident, but this vision has been dimmed in recent years.

REPUBLICAN ECONOMIC RECORD

Our factories have been idle, our workers unemployed.

We have a government limited in ability, timid in leadership, afraid of the future.

We have an administration which uses the evil of unemployment to fight the evil of inflation—and succeeds only in having the highest combination of unemployment, and inflation, in the 20th century.

We have an administration which talks about fiscal responsibility—and succeeds only in having the slowest economic growth in 30 years, and the most unbalanced budgets in our 200 year history.

In Kansas City we heard that the Republicans are proud of their economic record.

I have to agree that they have set some records that will live in our economic history books.

The unemployment rate today at 7.8% is higher than any time between the Great Depression and the inauguration of Gerald Ford. Neither Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson or even Nixon ever gave us a 7.8% unemployment rate. That's a record.

And unemployment has not been going

down in the past few months, it's been going up. There are over half a million more workers unemployed today than there were two months ago.

Our 6% inflation rate today is higher than any rate under Eisenhower, Kennedy or Johnson. So the last two presidents can share this entry in the record book.

The economy is producing \$150 billion less than in normal prosperity. That loss of production and income amounts to \$2,500 a year for every American family. That's another record.

Under Mr. Ford's budget, the public debt will rise \$210 billion. That exceeds the increases under his five predecessors and amounts to more than 1/2 of the public debt amassed during the entire history of our country. That's also a record.

Starting with a 5.5% rate of unemployment in August 1974, the unemployment rate jumped up to 8.9% in just nine months. That's a record.

In the last eight years, our rate of economic growth has been half as high as our historical average.

Economic stagnation has brought layoffs affecting 1/3 of the families in our country.

It has brought a tripling in the rate of inflation for food, housing and fuel.

It has thrown the federal budget out of balance because stagnation is expensive. For each one percent rise in the unemployment rate, the government loses \$14 billion in taxes that would otherwise have been collected, and at least \$2 billion in unemployment and welfare checks to support the unemployed.

Economic stagnation has made the average paycheck worth less today than in 1968.

This administration has indeed set many devastating new economic records.

But it has done something even worse. Our eight years of economic stagnation have changed the spirit and direction of America.

TIME FOR A CHANGE

For eight years, this administration has told us what we cannot do. It is time for our leaders to affirm what we, as a united nation, can and must do.

I believe we can grow and prosper again as a country. I believe it is time for national unity, rather than national division. I believe the President and Congress can work together, for a change. Different regions of the country can work together, for a change. Business and labor can work together, for a change.

We reject the Republican dogma that events are entirely beyond our control, that the government can play no creative role, and the best policy is to do nothing. We also reject the dogma that the federal government can solve all of our problems, or that the government always knows best.

We will look toward a philosophy that guides us toward new ideas—and to govern not by confusion and crisis, but with imagination and common sense, for a change.

We will replace stagnation with steady progress.

There are four ingredients necessary for a decent healthy economy. They are balanced, sustainable growth, full employment, stable prices, and a competent federal government working toward a balanced budget.

STEADY GROWTH

Ours is a troubled land today because the economic stagnation of the last eight years has diminished economic opportunities and reduced the American workers standard of living.

We cannot bring health to our economy and society until we move from stagnation to growth and productivity. To achieve this goal will require the forceful leadership of a President and a Congress, working together, who share the belief that stagnation and high unemployment will never cure inflation.

The President should have the authority to appoint the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, the chairman's term to run for the same four years as the President's. While

maintaining the Board's independence, the chairman would consult more closely with the President, other executive leaders, and the members of Congress in developing a consistent economic policy.

It is essential that we have fully coordinated credit and budget policy, prudent and wary of inflation, but firmly directed toward restoring job opportunities, a fair tax system, and steady economic growth.

Today, the economic policies of the federal government are too often without purpose, coordination and efficiency. Carefully coordinated and sensible budget and credit policies, that will permit lower interest rates, will enable us to build the homes, schools, and plant that are part of a good life that we seek.

Our economic policies will also be more consistent and purposeful if we begin to look and plan ahead, instead of staggering from crisis to crisis. A more coherent set of long-term economic goals can help us eliminate the wild roller-coaster dips of the last eight years.

Our goals of balanced growth and full employment cannot be separated.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

Our people are our most precious asset. We cannot afford to waste the talents and abilities of any person. We cannot afford the waste, especially, of our women and young people, and minority group members, who have been made to feel unwelcome in this stagnant economy. Half of the people who are now unemployed are less than 25 years old. The unemployment rate among teenagers is 18 percent. Among some minority groups, it is 34 percent.

We have seen the demoralizing impact on a family whose breadwinner cannot find a job. We understand the frustration of young people whose first encounter with the economic system consists of closed doors and dead ends. We are aware of the special impact on minority families who find that although the law is on their side, the economy is not.

It comes down to this: Will we as a nation force one group of our people to pay the price for the incompetence of their leaders? The Republicans say yes. I say no. I say that any economic philosophy which relies on keeping people out of work is morally, economically, and politically bankrupt.

To end this waste, we must rededicate ourselves to providing jobs at decent wages for all those who are able to work. My commitment during the next administration, and I know you share it, is to concentrate on putting our people back to work.

To do this, I will propose a comprehensive set of policies carefully targeted to meet this broad national need, and also carefully targeted to reduce unemployment among those groups and in those geographical areas where it is highest. By targeting our efforts to pockets of high unemployment, we will be able to reduce unemployment much lower without accelerating inflation.

I believe in the work ethic. This administration once talked about the work ethic instead of welfare. The work ethic is very simple. It means people at their jobs. In its economic mismanagement, this administration has done more harm to the work ethic than any other in the last 40 years.

If I am elected, I intend to run an efficient government, and efficiency requires investment as well as savings. When the Republicans say that it costs too much to put people back to work. I say it costs too much not to. This year, the government is paying \$17 billion in additional welfare payments and unemployment benefits because of the recession. I believe we can make a better investment.

It is wiser to invest in our youth than to let them run aimlessly over the streets of every community in this nation.

It is wiser to invest most of our new incentives to encourage the private sector to hire the unemployed. Private enterprise is the major supplier of jobs and skills in our economy, and we will need the full partici-

pation of American business management if we are to achieve full employment.

It is also wise to provide productive public jobs for those who are unable to find work in the private sector.

Our people want work, not welfare.

STABLE PRICES

For eight years, the Republicans have given us the worst economic mismanagement since the days of Herbert Hoover.

We've heard a lot of tough talk from the administration on inflation, and we're going to hear a lot more during the campaign. But tough talk cannot cover up their disastrous record. Campaign talk cannot cover up the 70 percent jump since 1968 in every family's food bill.

Campaign talk cannot disguise the 60 percent jump in health costs.

Tough campaign talk cannot disguise the 70 percent rise in the cost of owning a home, or the 30 percent increase in mortgage interest rates. High inflation and high interest rates have put the housing industry, which provides the jobs and the housing we need, into a depression. The unemployment rate among construction workers is now 17%.

Since 1968, when Nixon was elected, the average cost of the same new house has leaped by \$16,000, which puts the dream of a new home out of the reach of many American families. This helps to explain the recent 9% drop in new housing starts last month.

Campaign talk cannot hide the fact that prices rose three times as fast during the past eight years as they did under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

That's what all this tough talk about inflation really comes down to—the worst inflation in over a century. And a 1968 dollar that's worth about 60 cents. No wonder the Treasury now issues \$2 bills and no wonder the public doesn't seem to like them.

I pledge to you and to the American people that, if I am elected, we will never use unemployment and recession as a tool to fight inflation. We will never sacrifice someone's job, his livelihood for the sake of an ill-advised economic game plan.

After the record of the past eight years, we almost forget that inflation is not inevitable and we don't have to sit back and give up on it. We should remember that from 1961 through 1968 in a period of rising prosperity, inflation averaged about 2%. It was not a coincidence that those were the eight years out of the last 24 when Democratic presidents were in the White House.

If I am elected, we will establish a comprehensive program to fight the many causes of inflation. Our goal is to reduce inflation to 4% or less within four years. I will make sure that every person who serves in our administration will join with Congress and other leaders to reduce the impact of debilitating inflation.

We will fight inflation through increased productivity which will result from our policy of strong steady growth, at least twice the 7% rate maintained under this administration.

We will fight inflation by anticipating bottlenecks and capacity shortages and moving in advance to prevent them.

Whenever inflation reflects an imbalance between supply and demand, we will choose a strategy that first expands supply rather than restricting demand.

We will fight inflation by creating agricultural production policies which will both maintain the income of our farmers and ensure stable food prices for our consumers.

We will fight inflation through a vigorous antitrust policy which will help push efficiency up and non-competitive prices down.

We will fight inflation by eliminating governmental regulations which drive up prices and serve to protect only the industry being regulated. It takes more than talk and study in this area—it takes presidential leadership

and a partnership between a president and a Congress that trust each other and can work together.

But above all, we will fight inflation by putting our people back to work.

Nowhere is unity and cooperation more important than in this fight against inflation. During the recent crisis years American labor has shown remarkable moderation in the face of inflationary pressures which were not of your making. I will not ask labor to do anything that would jeopardize the purchasing power of the average worker. But I will honestly ask you and business to cooperate with me, in a voluntary effort to get our people back to work, and inflation under control.

For my part, I will do everything I can to give the American people the kind of well managed, efficient, cost-conscious government they want and deserve.

Every year the average American taxpayer works at least three months for the government, but each year many rich Americans don't pay any taxes at all. Comprehensive tax reform is a necessity; and if I'm elected, we'll have it!

Steady growth, full employment, and stable prices will enable us to achieve our fourth goal—competent government with a balanced federal budget by 1980.

BALANCED BUDGET

The Republicans are always calling themselves the party of fiscal responsibility. But we have to look at what they do, not what they say.

The deficit for the year just ended was \$65 billion. That is the largest deficit in our entire history.

In fact, during the last eight years, this administration has piled up a total deficit and national debt—on which we all pay interest—almost as great as the total for all other administrations, in war as well as peace, in our 200 year history.

The interest charges alone on the \$270 billion public debt created in the last eight years will amount to \$19 billion per year. That is a perpetual charge of \$350 a year, every year, for every family in the country.

The Republicans have never realized that the government cannot balance its budget by unbalancing the budgets of American families. A family out of work cannot pay taxes. A family out of work requires public support.

The American people know that there is a better answer. We know that in a well-managed and steadily growing economy we can create jobs, maintain stable prices, meet our people's needs, and achieve a balanced budget. And we can accomplish these goals while restricting the government to the same share of our national output that it now has.

Living within our means will require discipline and efficiency. Working people follow those guidelines within their own budgets. Through a continuous, zero-based budgeting review of our expenditures, we can make the Federal government follow those guidelines, too. New services will be phased in gradually and prudently and predictably, as we can afford them.

Unlike this administration, we see no conflict between a government which is responsive and compassionate and one which is efficient and careful in its use of the people's money.

Today, I have outlined some of the things we can do to end economic stagnation and meet our national economic problems. There is a lot more we can do, too.

A NEW SENSE OF PURPOSE

But first we need a president to pull us together and give us a new sense of purpose. A sense of purpose that rests on the belief that, if we work hard together, with some imagination and common sense, we can do a

better job. That is the promise of America—to grow, and improve, and to do better than what we have done in the past.

There is no greater obstacle to improving our economic performance than the thinking of this Republican administration that things can't change, that we can't solve our problems, and that we can't do better.

That's wrong. That's a denial of the promise on which this nation was founded.

It is a denial of our capacity—our spirit—to evolve and to grow, to develop new solutions to old problems.

And it is a denial of the spirit which flourished in another Republican administration—112 years ago.

"The dogmas of the quiet past," said President Lincoln, "are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our cause is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

Act anew.

Act anew we must to solve the problems of inflation and unemployment, too. To restore economic prosperity that is justly shared among all of our people.

And solve these problems we will, with your guidance, your support, your spirit, and your faith.

CONGRESSIONAL BICENTENNIAL
SALUTE TO REV. FINBARR M.
CORR, DIRECTOR, FAMILY LIFE
BUREAU, PATERSON, N.J., COM-
MEMORATING SEPTEMBER 19,
1976, AS "NATIONAL FAMILY DAY"
DEDICATED TO ALL OF THE FAM-
ILIES OF AMERICA

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Family Life Movement which seeks to provide a forum for the sharing of the unique gifts of family tradition among our people during the celebration of our Nation's Bicentennial Year and ask that you and our colleagues here in the Congress join with me in supporting the following resolution which I have introduced in the House:

H.J. RES. 1075

Joint resolution designating September 19 as "National Family Day" during the celebration of our Nation's Bicentennial year.

Whereas the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of our Nation is a time to reflect on the history of our great country and the good deeds of our people which have placed our representative democracy second to none among all nations throughout the world; and

Whereas America has gained its strength and fiber through the tradition of a strong family life which has truly enriched the educational, cultural, social, and economic well-being of our communities, States, and Nation; and

Whereas the very basic foundation of our society in preserving our human values, nurturing our children, developing respect and understanding for others, caring for our elderly and perpetuating our cultural and spiritual heritage stems from family life;

Whereas our United States of America is comprised of family groups from all over the world, bringing varied expressions of familial solidarity which have been adopted by our people, adding to the quality of our American way of life; and

Whereas the family life movement in many areas throughout our Nation is celebrating September 19, 1976, as "Family Day" to celebrate and honor the family, which has contributed in large measure to America's evolution as a two-hundred-year-old nation that has achieved global preeminence as a shining example of a united and compassionate family which continues to extend a helping hand to families in need throughout the world; and

Whereas it is indeed appropriate to honor the contributions and special place in America of families and those who labor to create the wealth and destiny of our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That September 19 of our Nation's Bicentennial year be designated as "National Family Day" and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that day to reflect upon and reaffirm our belief in family life, demonstrate our support for the concepts of family life, and provide a forum for the sharing of the cherished values of our heritage and the unique gifts of family tradition amongst all of our people.

Mr. Speaker, may I particularly commend to you and our colleagues the outstanding work being carried on in my congressional district in the Family Life Movement by the Reverend Finbarr M. Corr, Ed.D., director of the diocese of Paterson, Family Life Bureau, Paterson, N.J., and by the Board of Governors of the Family Life Bureau, as follows:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

The Honorable:

Edward E. Aboyoung, Frank Alberta, Jesse J. Barton, John Basalyga, William V. Burke, Rev. Clement Cardillo, Thomas Chidiac, N. Francis Cimmino, Nicholas F. Cimmino, Esq., Michael Cipoletti, Jack Connell, Reverend Finbarr M. Corr, Dr. Claude Coutinho, Vincent C. Duffy, Esq.

Martha Fuerst, Marjorie Furrey, Louis P. Gantner, John F. Geaney, Jr., Esq., Charles N. Ged, George J. Ged, Dr. Joseph Grecco, Agnes Guard, Edward B. Haines, Michael Halleran, Paul Hennessey, Eugene Hilker, Charles Kessler, Rev. Robert Kirchgessner.

Vincent Kramer, Raymond Luchko, Mary Manocchio, Sylvia Mancin, Joseph J. Menegus, Ray Misajet, Peg Cleary (Murray).

Ed Najjar, Frank Olandisi, Vincent S. Parrillo, Dr. Roland C. Pasquariello, Alba Paterson, Vincent A. Perneti, Esq.

Ernest W. Potter, Jr., Jeremiah Quinlan, William F. Rabbatt, Esq., John J. Reid, Donald Runz.

Al Scala, William Sellinger, Esq., John J. Sinsimer, Gerard Thomas, John Turi, Donald J. Vasta, John C. Wegner, Robert G. Weiss, Esq.

Father Corr and his program committee under the cochairmanship of Peg Murray and Ray Luchko have been busily preparing for the celebration of "Family Day" at the Clifton Stadium in my congressional district on September 19. Special plaudits are also extended to the program committee whose membership is comprised of leading citizens of our community, as follows:

FAMILY DAY COMMITTEE

Chairmanship: Robert L. Marcolus, Honorary Chairman, Reverend Finbarr M. Corr, Ray Luchko, Peg Murray.

Advertising and Public Relations: Anthony Morello, Jr., Patty Scanapieco.

Announcer Committee: Joe Chidiac.

Church Support Committee: John Reid.

Ecumenical Service Committee: Rev. Richard Rento.

Exhibit Committee: Donald J. Vasta—in-dustry, Mary Ellen Karl—agencies.

Flag Committee: J. Robert Tracey—Morris County.

Flyers and Promotions Committee: Mae Svec.

Fund Raising Committee: John Basalyga, Charles Kessler.

Gift Committee: Robert Kurdock.

Invited Guests Committee: Mrs. John Reid.

Keynote Speaker Committee: Rev. Finbarr M. Corr.

Music Committee: Michael Cipoletti.

Parade Committee: William Walters.

Parade Participants Committee: Ray Luchko.

Refreshment Committee: Gerald Thomas.

Speakers Bureau Committee: Stephanie Zonenberg.

Stadium Committee: John Rutledge.

Transportation Committee: Rev. Frank Ferraioli.

Welcoming Address Speaker Committee: Rev. C. Manning.

Advisory: Rabbi Eugene Markowitz, Assemblyman William Bate, Sister Grace Engels, Sister Mary Louise, William Burke, Theodore Kyles, Reinhold Kissner, Rev. Charles Manning, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Smith, Earl Modean, Mary Hinkle.

The program is, as follows:

What: A Celebration and reaffirmation of the concept of family—cultural, environmental, spiritual and social.

Why: To help stem the tide of negative attitudes towards the family unit by gathering in unity and purpose, to stand up and be counted as supporters of family life.

Who: The mothers, fathers and children of New Jersey as well as the extended family—business leaders, community and government leaders, ethnic and fraternal groups and their families. ***And special guest, Mr. Pat Boone.

When: September 19, 1976 from 12 noon to 4:30 p.m.

Where: Clifton Stadium, Clifton, New Jersey.

Sponsor: The Family Life Board of Governors and local industrialists who support the family unit as the basic foundation of our society.

EVENTS

Exhibits and displays by local industries.

Announcer, George Meade, WOR Radio.

Parade of family life supporters into Clifton Stadium.

Welcoming address by Rev. Charles Gallagher.

Entertainment by the West Point Glee Club.

Keynote address and musical celebration by Pat Boone, entertainer and family man.

Ecumenical service.

Join in with Mr. Boone and all the Family Day participants in a round of songs.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to submit this resolution to designate September 19 of our Bicentennial Year as "National Family Day." Thank you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARTHA KEYS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mrs. KEYS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 2, 1976, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall No. 693, on final passage of H.R. 13636, extension of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

THE BALANCE(S) OF POWER—IV: STRATEGIC DEFENSIVE BALANCE

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, to continue my discussion of the strategic defensive balance in my series on the "Balance(s) of Power," I wish to expand the section dealing with the debate on U.S. civil defense which has again surfaced as a topic of controversy.*

I wish to insert a letter written by Ruby Thurmer in support of an article by Arthur A. Broyles and Eugene Wigner, "Civil Defense in Limited War—A Debate: Have Recent Developments in Strategic Weapons Given Us Reason to Look at Civil Defense in a New Context?" that appeared in the August 31, 1976, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my series on the "Balance(s) of Power."

In her letter, Ruby Thurmer sharpens the focus of the debate by arguing that civil defense preparedness has been tested and proven effective in both the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, and by noting that it is unthinkable that anyone could actually believe that the people of the United States should be left completely unprotected against nuclear weapons effects, simply because it—and the implementation of a reasonable civil defense program for the United States—"might upset someone." Should the present lack of preparation continue and should a real crisis develop, the majority of the American people are going to be pretty unhappy to learn that "somebody in Washington" has not taken care of the matter.

The views expressed in the letter that follows summarize the essence of the official position taken by the Emergency Technology Section, Health Physics Division of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Ruby Thurmer is involved in an intensive research effort regarding civil defense preparations of foreign countries, and is associated with the Emergency Technology Section, Health Physics Division of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn., which is operated by the Union Carbide Corp. under contract with the U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration.

The letter follows:

I am not an expert on military strategy; however, I am involved in an intensive research effort regarding civil defense preparations by other countries of the world. Therefore, it was most disturbing to find statements such as "Furthermore, the development and rehearsal of civil defense plans... could be viewed with alarm by an opponent," and "Implementation of an extensive civil defense system... would counter the progress that has been made toward reduced international tensions," being used as arguments against implementation of a reasonable civil defense program for the United States. This reasoning must be a great source of amusement for the Russian and Chinese leaders. Both of these nations

* See Part IV (III), August 24, 1976, pp. E4258 Congressional Record; Part IV (IV), August 31, 1976, pp. E4785 Congressional Record.

put a great deal of their defense efforts into civil defense.

The Chinese tunnels under their cities are equipped with radioactive-dust filters, medical centers, stores, restaurants, rest and recreation areas, and water is supplied to them by natural wells. The entire population of Peking reportedly can be sheltered within five minutes. This is fact, not fiction.

The Nixons spent 45 minutes touring a section of these shelters under the Ta Cha La District of southern Peking during their recent visit to China. In his banquet toast, Mr. Nixon stated

"...and then when we saw the air raid shelters that had been built by the people themselves in the very blocks in which they live, we were reminded of the threat and the danger to the promise of China's future and the future of all people in the world in the event that war would come."¹

Mr. Drell implies that the Soviet civil defense efforts are merely propaganda and not really effective means of protecting the population. Below are excerpts from an article by the Secretary General of the Austrian Civil Defense Union.²

THE SOVIET CIVIL DEFENSE

Even though surreptitious attempts have been repeatedly made from the East... to install a counter-propaganda aiming at undermining civil defense's setting up and development on the Western side of the Iron Curtain, the USSR and its allies however attach great importance to Civil Defense. Thus in that part of the world, Civil Defense is on an equal footing with other measures within the programme of total defense.

The Soviet Civil Defense essentially consists of two main bodies: the Anti-Air Defense (MPWO) and the paramilitary organization DOSAAF. Their closely-knit network covers the whole territory of the Soviet Union... and as Civil Defense also comes within the field of activity of the Warsaw Pact States' Unified High-Command, the network also spreads to the Baltic Sea, the Elbe, the Bavarian-Czech frontier; and besides, USSR's Eastern allies have their own national Civil Defense organisations.

...Thus supported by the system, Eastern Civil Defense has no problems of personnel or material. Every citizen has the duty to serve in Civil Defense; the educational level is good and there is no lack of equipment.

Here greater attention is given to the building of shelters because it is agreed that Civil Defense credibility is linked to the achievement of the shelter construction programme. Under Malenkov already, undergrounds in Moscow and elsewhere had been converted into shelters.

In an article by Peter Laurie,³ the fact that Great Britain (like the U.S.) lacks adequate civil defense capabilities was pointed out quite dramatically. The author had visited Switzerland and observed their CD preparations. He states:

"Briefly, the Swiss think that war in Europe—and that means a very nasty nuclear war—is a sporting chance any time from 1980 on. Already they have dug most of a second, underground Switzerland. Every home is obliged to build, stock, and maintain a shelter where it can lurk for two months. Each community has a communal shelter, equipment store, and command

bunker which will resist three atmospheres' overpressure (1 megaton at 1 mile). There are a vast number of underground hospitals. The Army has burrowed itself into the Alps, and is reputed to have stores there for three years, where it can menace the flank of any invader of the homeland.

"Sweden is much the same, with an elaborate programme of shelter building, putting power stations and factories underground, surrealist opening cliffs for warships. It seems likely that after the holocaust Europe will be run by Swedes and Swiss, trundling around in immaculate ABC suits, wearing that pained, 'I told you so' expression on their faces. A most unpleasant prospect.

"... Come the '80's, a few holes in the ground might be judicious. Switzerland spends 0.4 percent of GNP on civil defense. For that modest amount, in 15 years, they have assured themselves almost complete protection for people and important resources. Is £5 a head a year too much to spend on preserving the British way of life?"

These quotations are just a small sample of the published "propaganda" regarding the activities of other countries in preparing to protect their most valuable resource—their people. There is no indication that any of them accept the "doomsday" philosophy. In fact, the only doom promised is for those who refuse to follow instructions.

I would refer the reader to a publication in 1961⁴ which attempted, even 15 years ago, to squelch such outrageous thinking. At that time there were two trends (they may sound familiar): (1) that there is no room for hope and (2) that to proclaim the truth is to spread panic. In order to refute these arguments, it was pointed out by the then CD Administrator of the Philippines, Ing. A. G. Eugenio, that:

1. Ten years after the Hiroshima bombing a. the population swelled from the original 270,000 to 400,000, b. Its agriculture became better, and c. Its species more beautiful.

2. Although there is no civil defense for people within the circle of destruction directly under a nuclear weapon detonation, people outside this area, can survive if inside a shelter with 2 ft of concrete or 3 ft of earth cover. Hiroshima and Nagasaki inhabitants who were in dug-outs, tunnels, or caves escaped totally unscathed.

3. The danger of an atomic war should not breed unreasoned or paralyzing fear, but on the contrary should contribute to speeding up protective measures.

It seems almost unthinkable that anyone could actually believe that the people of the United States should be left completely unprotected against nuclear weapons effects, simply because it might upset someone. Why do our possible opponents' civil defense activities not upset us? They certainly make no secret of them. And if, as Mr. Drell implies, the Soviets have not done everything that they claim to have done, they are still far ahead of us, which (by reverse reasoning) should cause us "alarm that they are preparing for executing a first attack" and "counter the progress being made toward reduced international tensions." There have been many civil defense exercises in the Soviet Union. In fact, the entire fishing village of Sevastopol had an evacuation exercise in 1971⁵ and the director of this particular project had had previous experience, indicating other similar large-scale experiments.

Civil defense is taught in the schools in the Soviet Union, beginning in the second grade and continuing through post-graduate

schools. A professor at a Russian university related an amusing aspect concerning the abbreviation for civil defense on the course lists at his school. *Grazhdanskaya Oborona* (Civil Defense) is shortened to GROB, which is, itself, a word meaning coffin. This causes a certain amount of embarrassment to the instructors. The young people who are moving into the Soviet work force are thoroughly familiar with the means and methods of protection from "weapons of mass destruction."

This education process works nicely with the Soviet 1976 training-year plans to center the civil defense exercises around the enterprises. The announcement of the new program by USSR Civil Defense Chief, A. Altunin states that every factory, collective farm, educational institution, etc. shall be responsible for holding "comprehensive site exercises" which are to include workers, workers' families, and the non-workers living near the enterprise. These are to be held under extremely realistic conditions, simulating as nearly as possible actual crisis situations. To be included in the tasks assigned are the performance of rescue and restoration work, shelter building, shelter occupancy, dispersal and evacuation, firefighting, reconnaissance, and decontamination, as required by the individual site.

Perhaps, if the people here in the United States were kept informed as to what other countries are doing to afford their populations the opportunity to survive a nuclear war, then attitudes might change drastically. One thing is certain. Should the present lack of preparation continue and should a real crisis develop, the majority of the American people are going to be pretty unhappy to learn that "somebody in Washington" has not taken care of the matter.

MURPHY'S LAW

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members of Congress who are at least somewhat familiar with the issues associated with S. 521, a bill to update the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953—particularly those in the overwhelming majority of the House and Senate who voted for the legislation, are aware of the travesty perpetrated by the Wall Street Journal in its editorial of August 31, 1976.

While I had assumed that reasonable persons would have ignored the editorial, it has been inserted in the RECORD, by a Member of the other body. Therefore, I feel compelled, out of loyalty to the vast majority in both Houses who voted for the bill, to rebut the editorial where it is factually wrong, to correct the editorial where inaccurate, and to set the record straight where it is purposefully, and intentionally, and with malice aforethought, misleading.

Consequently, for those Members not familiar with the OCS legislation, I am inserting the editorial and my entire response to the Journal which contains ample proof that the newspaper did a disservice to the American people and to the Nation. Although an edited version of my letter was printed in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal I feel obliged to make the entire document available to readers of the RECORD.

¹ Peking, February 25, 1976 (HSINHUA), as reported in *Daily Report, People's Republic of China*, FBIS-CHI-76-49, 26 February 1976, Vol. I, No. 39, pp. A3-4.

² Josef Hans, "An European Point of View of Civil Defense," *International Civil Defense Bulletin*, No. 231, Geneva, Sept. 1974, pp. 2-3.

³ Peter Laurie, "About the Continuing Possibility of Megadeath," *New Scientist*, 29 January 1976, p. 247.

⁴ "Is Protection Possible Against the Atom Bomb?" *International Civil Defense Bulletin*, No. 77, Geneva, November 1961, p. 1-2.

⁵ Joanne S. Galler, "Soviet Civil Defense," *Survive*, Vol. 6, No. 3, May-June 1973, pp. 9-11.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 31, 1976]

MURPHY'S LAW

There are several laws attributed to Murphy, the most notable being "Anything that can go wrong, will." We've never been able to find out who this Murphy is, but if H.R. 6218 is typical of the legislation drafted by Rep. John Murphy, the Long Island Democrat, we may have found our man.

Mr. Murphy's bill, an amendment to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, has absolutely nothing in it that would make things better. And what there is in the bill that can go wrong probably will. It was thus made to order for this particular Congress, and easily passed the House in late July and is now being fitted to a companion bill written by Senator Jackson, which drew only 19 negative votes in the Senate. President Ford will have another veto opportunity in a few weeks.

There aren't many laws on the books that could not stand refining and improvement, but the existing OCS law has so clearly served the public interest that there is no percentage in opening it up for repairs of a major nature.

Both environmentally and financially, the legislation's record in the Gulf of Mexico is superb. In more than 20 years, 19,000 wells have been drilled with only one spill, and there was no permanent ecological damage from that. The oil industry has grossed \$23 billion in oil and gas sales. Government has received \$19.9 billion of that amount. The industry, which so far has spent \$34 billion on development of the Gulf OCS, may eventually get a return on investment of no more than 7%. If there is anything here for U.S. taxpayers, and consumers to complain about, it isn't evident.

Murphy's Law, though, is the equivalent of sending your Rolls-Royce down to Sam's Garage for a ring and valve job at 20,000 miles, whether it needs it or not.

The least of its mischief is that it adds a few dozen more screening procedures on top of the more than 100 checkpoints an oil company now faces before it can start drilling. Taxpayers and consumers, of course, pay all the bills for ecological returns that are beyond the vanishing point. It is money thrown away to purchase delay.

Worse, though, are the innovative financial provisions that purport to maximize revenues from leasing and production, but which can logically only inhibit production and revenues.

Before offering a tract for lease, the Interior Department would be required to contract an exploration on behalf of the taxpayer. The idea is that the government will be able to get more in bonuses and royalties if it knows first hand if there's a jackpot under the OCS tract. In effect, the taxpayer is giving Interior Department bureaucrats a pile of money to gamble with, and if the bureaucrats lose, so what? It's not their money. Senator Jackson's version would actually set up a federal corporation with \$500 million to play with.

The other innovation that can only go wrong is the requirement that the Interior Secretary let out so many tracts on royalty bidding instead of bonus bidding. The idea is to give Mom & Pop Oil Explorers a chance at the big time. Bonus bidding, now standard, requires up-front money by the explorer, which means he has a serious incentive to explore. Mom & Pop can compete on royalty bidding because there's no up-front money. They can promise to give the government 80% of production, win the tract, dig one well hoping for a North Slope, and abandon the tract if it's dry.

What's wrong with the current system? When the nine square miles of Baltimore Canyon tracts were put up to bid a few weeks ago, there were 410 bids on 101 out of

the 154 tracts. The government rejected 8 of the bids as too low, and collected \$1,127 billion in bonuses. It will be five years before the first drop of oil is produced. The reason Mom & Pop Explorers don't belong in this kind of game is exactly the same reason why they should steer clear of the baccarat tables in Las Vegas. The same goes for the desk jockeys at Interior.

Unless Representative Murphy has some secret maps detailing OCS oil fields, which he will turn over to the federal explorers he is asking the taxpayers to finance, there's nothing in his law worth saving. When it hits President Ford's desk it should be vetoed, quietly, mercifully, and we will promise to forget about it if Mr. Murphy will.

WASHINGTON, D.C., September 2, 1976.

THE EDITOR,
Wall Street Journal,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial, "Murphy's Law" (August 31, 1976), is, at best, inaccurate, and in fact, intentionally misleading and deceptive.

Both the Senate and the House have passed amendments to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, H.R. 6218, now called S. 521, is the product of nine sets of public hearings in 14 different coastal cities by the OCS Committee. We heard testimony from more than 300 witnesses throughout the country, and held 12 days of mark-up sessions, during which we considered almost 200 amendments. This was followed by four days of floor debate by the House, considering 80 more amendments. The bill was not, as you claim, "drafted" by me. It was prepared by all the Members of the Committee, and by many other Members of the full House.

Your editorial makes it appear that this bill has no support. Not only is it supported by almost all coastal states and environmental groups, it is supported by the AFL-CIO, smaller oil companies, and the gas distributors throughout the country. In fact, the opposition to the bill comes from the larger oil companies, the seven "sob" sisters, and not from the general energy industry. It should be remembered that these large companies are the same ones that capitulated and are capitulating to the Arabs.

You ask "What's wrong with the current system?" It is anticompetitive, potentially unsafe, irrational and antiquated. Present OCS leasing policies do not consider the requests for national protection of the environment, for consideration of the legitimate interests of coastal communities, for balancing short-term against long-term needs, and for improving the safety conditions for workers.

The OCS bill is recognized by most as a moderate attempt to update an outmoded 1953 law, which, despite your unsupported statements to the contrary, has not worked well.

In specific response to your misstatements, the record of offshore drilling is not superb. By discussing only the Gulf of Mexico, you failed to recognize the enormous damage resulting from the 1969 Santa Barbara oil spill. In addition, you did not mention the serious, and often fatal, accidents to divers and other workers on offshore facilities.

You do not mention that the Administration has reversed the policy of gradual development it undertook in the Gulf, and has now decided to accelerate lease sales in all previously undeveloped areas. You completely ignore the enormous impact that such "accelerated leasing" has on previously untouched coastal communities and the need to supply information to and obtain input from such coastal areas.

You stress that OCS administration is "financially sound". Your paper has continually stressed the need to promote "free enterprise competition"; yet you support continuing the present anti-competitive offshore leasing sys-

tem. In the Baltimore Canyon lease sale, Exxon—the largest oil company—was able to secure one-third of the leases offered; the top seven oil companies, either alone or as the lead party, obtained 75 to 80 percent of the leases. This is not competition—it is oligopoly.

Requiring use of new bidding systems will bring in other companies. Your use of the term "Mom and Pop" explorers is an insult to many multi-million dollar energy companies, including gas distributors. Smaller companies have been drilling most of the wells onshore and now seek an equal opportunity offshore. Gas distributors have been supplying natural gas to its customers for years, and now seek an opportunity to eliminate the middleman and produce their own gas. These alternate systems are not untested; they are used successfully by many foreign countries and by states now leasing or licensing their lands.

You indicate that none but the seven sisters will efficiently exploit resources. Present Interior Department regulations, which would be substantially improved by the new OCS bill, provide for strict diligence requirements and penalties for premature abandonment are more likely to occur when development is by the larger oil companies rather than by the smaller ones.

It is unfortunate that you state that the industry "may" only get a seven percent return on its investment on OCS leases. By that logic, the industry "may" also get a return of three-to-five times that amount. Calculation of bonus costs and exploration costs which have so far indicated a small return to producers does not take into account the fact that the fields already leased will continue to produce oil and gas for some time with a return to the government of only 16 1/2 percent per barrel. At our hearings, representatives of the oil industry indicated that they eventually expect to make a return far in excess of the seven percent you suggest (Standard Oil of California and Shell indicated an eventual net income of 25 to 30 percent), especially in light of continually increasing prices for oil and natural gas. Moreover, because of technical provisions in tax statutes, the net return is substantially less than the real return. To paraphrase the statement of one witness from a large oil company, if they didn't believe that they would get an adequate return, they wouldn't be seeking to obtain the leases.

You indicate that the bill requires the Interior Department to contract for exploration. There is simply no such provisions in the bill. The industry and the Interior Department both agree that the 1953 OCS Act allows exploration prior to a lease sale, and in fact, such geological exploration has been conducted pre-lease since 1953. The proposed House bill does not in any way mandate government exploration, by contract or any other way.

Finally, it must be recognized that the Outer Continental Shelf is federal land—not private domain. A lease grants the right to explore, develop and produce—it does not grant the right to despoil. It is not only the desire, but the duty, of Congress to set policy, guidelines and standards for government property. It is not in the public interest to allow exploitation of public resources to be determined by a few uncontrolled companies.

Unlike the unsupported statements in your editorial, these facts can be documented by our hearings and record. I am therefore attaching a full set of our hearings and the Committee report for your review.

Sincerely,
JOHN M. MURPHY,
Representing Staten Island and
Manhattan, not Long Island.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME
DOWN**HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, officials of the District Government began a career criminals program. As the following article states, the program may be responsible for a reduced crime rate in the District.

It is too early to draw conclusions from these results, but the results are encouraging. Also, cities such as New Orleans and my home of Louisville have experienced similar reductions in crime from career criminal programs.

Under these programs, special prosecutorial and police personnel are assigned to the cases of repeat offenders and judges are urged to detain these individuals until trial. As a complement to this effort the District Committee reported, and the House passed a bill to reform the D.C. bail laws and to expand judges' authority to detain repeat offenders. I hope that the Senate will act quickly on this bill to further the task of cleaning up crime in the District.

Chief Judge Greene, Police Chief Cullinane, and the prosecutor Mr. Silbert are to be commended for their efforts and initiative in this area. I hope that Congress can back them up with legislation to reform the D.C. bail laws.

I insert the following article:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 2, 1976]

MURDERS HERE HIT NEW LULL

(By Paul W. Valentine and Joe Ritchie)

D.C. police yesterday reported only nine murders in the city during August—the lowest monthly total since September, 1968, except for November, 1975, when a low of eight was reported.

While the police department had no official explanation, some homicide detectives say they think last month's low figure is not entirely a fluke.

They note there have been fewer narcotics- and robbery-related murders in recent months, apparently because of a crackdown by city judges who are revoking parole and imposing high financial bail more frequently on full-time criminals and recidivists.

Police last month attributed a comparable reduction in reported robberies to the same phenomenon—the removal of a relatively small handful of hard-core criminal repeaters from the streets by court action.

The city typically has 20 to 25 homicides a month, though the figure fluctuates unevenly, and police statisticians warn the numbers are so small that it is risky to say there are trends over a short time.

Asked to explain August's low figure of nine murders, Capt. Joseph O'Brien, commander of the homicide branch, said: "Crime in general is down. What can you say? We like what we're seeing and just hope it stays that way."

Another veteran homicide detective said that while homicides resulting from domestic and neighborhood quarrels—the so-called "crimes of passion"—have held steady during recent months, murders by professional criminals involved in narcotics or other illicit activity have declined.

"The judges are locking more people up," he said.

The only month in which fewer than nine

homicides have been recorded in the last eight years was November, 1975, when eight murders occurred, according to police statistics. Police officials said the figure is an inexplicable fluke, noting that more than 20 homicides were reported in the months immediately preceding and following November, 1975.

The monthly totals for homicides this summer, by contrast, have been gradually declining. There were 22 in May, 18 in June, 13 in July and 9 in August, according to police figures.

The record high monthly total for homicides is 33 in October, 1974.

A low of nine homicides was last reported in September, 1968, and again in April, 1967. Eight were reported in December, 1966.

Police statisticians noted that multiple or "mass" murders can throw monthly statistics off balance. They cited the Hanafi Muslim sect murders in January, 1973, when seven persons were killed in a single incident. A total of 31 homicides were reported in that month.

The figure of nine homicides for August is a preliminary total given by the homicide branch of the police department. It is subject to change if some of the deaths ultimately are ruled suicidal or accidental or if other homicides that occurred in August are brought to police attention.

A total of 138 homicides have been reported so far this year, compared with 166 for the same period last year.

MAJ. GEN. FRANK ROUSE**HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Frank Rouse did not live an exceptionally long life, but it was extraordinary in its fullness. Of his 65 years, he served 35 in the Air Force, in posts from Europe to the Far East, in jobs from pilot to commander of one of the world's greatest logistics centers.

General Rouse learned to fly in San Antonio, in 1934. In his service lifetime he worked with airplanes as flimsy as cloth and wood, and as powerful as any ever built. There is no explaining how different a wooden propeller is from a jet engine, nor how much more complex the world itself became during the lifetime of General Rouse. He worked with it all, and worked well.

His last assignment was commander of the San Antonio Air Material Area, a not very glamorous name for a post that is housed at Kelly Air Force Base, one of the very oldest, most honored, most fondly remembered spots in the U.S. Air Force. At the time he became commander, Kelly was struggling to meet the demands of a war thousands of miles away. General Rouse had not only to contend with that enormously difficult problem, but to meet and overcome an accumulation of problems that had been gathering for 30 years. He had to create an effective program for equal employment opportunity, and he did. He had to overcome tensions, grievances, and all the problems that gathered in the late sixties, and he did. He inherited a physical plant that was too old to accommo-

date its tasks, insufficient for the times, inadequate to work in. He laid the groundwork for an enormous rebuilding program at Kelly that is going forward even today. His successors found a command that was much improved, a command that today still benefits from the strengths of his leadership.

General Rouse was a fighter pilot by trade, and had 150 combat hours during World War II. Yet he had the wit and tenacity to work successfully in any number of other posts, including the command of Kelly Air Force Base when it had better than 33,000 employees.

It cannot be said that General Rouse ever became famous; he was never in a position that brought fame. But he was beyond any doubt a solid citizen, a good airman, an outstanding leader, a success in jobs where anything less than a superior performance would have been a failure. He mastered every challenge with skill, courage, patience, and grace. There were not many like him, and he will be missed.

Frank Rouse died in San Antonio on September 3. He was president of a bank at the time of his death; he retired from military service in 1969. After services in San Antonio, his remains were returned to Yakima, Wash., for burial.

Those who knew and worked with Frank Rouse admired him. I have seen many military commanders, all able people. Few of them measured up to the standard of General Rouse. He was a man of rare talent, mature thought, deep insight, great skill; and he was a man of strength and integrity. He was a true gift to the people of this country, and I grieve his passing.

VOTING RECORD

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in a continuing attempt to provide my voting record for the 1st session of the 94th Congress for the benefit of anyone who would like to examine that record, I would like to have printed here my votes on matters ranging from housing appropriations to authorization of a National Women's Conference. The material follows:

VOTING RECORD

H.R. 8070 HOUSING, SPACE, VETERANS
APPROPRIATIONS

Amendment to delete all funding for a new rental subsidy program (Section 8) created by the '74 omnibus housing act (PL 93-383) rejected, 4-326, No; Amendment to reduce fair market rents—used to determine the amount of a subsidy—under the Section 8 rental subsidy program to 75% of those established by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in April '75, rejected 137-277, Aye.

Final passage of the bill to appropriate \$51,429,024,000 in FY '76 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, National Aeronautics and Space Administra-

tion and several other independent agencies and to appropriate \$5,434,617,000 for the three-month transition period between FY '76 and FY '77, passed 321-25, Yea; 6-24-75.

Conference report on the bill to appropriate \$49,344,914,000 in FY '76 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, NASA, the Veterans Administration and several other independent agencies and to appropriate \$5,648,675,000 for the three month transition period between FY '76 and FY '77, adopted 334-41, Not Voting; motion that the House recede from its disagreement with a Senate-passed amendment that would have earmarked 75% of FY '76 contract authority for a rental subsidy program (Section 8) for new construction assistance and that the House concur in an amendment to a conference report to earmark 50% of Section 8 contract authority for new construction, agreed to 202-174, Nay; 10-3-75.

H.R. 6755 VIETNAM REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

Amendment to require President to report on refugee program every 30 days to the House Judiciary and the Senate Foreign Relations Committees, rejected 158-261, No; Amendment to bar use of funds authorized by bill to assist refugees unless similar assistance was available to Americans facing the same personal economic hardship, rejected 71-346, No; Amendment to authorize funds beyond 9-30-77, exclusively for education, rejected 80-327, No; Amendment to substitute \$507-million authorization for open-ended authorization, adopted 353-54, Aye.

Final passage of Vietnam Refugee Assistance Act authorization of \$507-million, passed 281-31, Yea; 5-14-75.

H.R. 8841 FEDERAL INSECTICIDE, FUNGICIDE, AND RODENTICIDE ACT

Adoption of the Rule (H. Res. 734) providing for Floor consideration of the bill to authorize \$47.9-million for the EPA pesticide control program through September 30, 1976, adopted 369-0, Yea; Motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider the bill, adopted 325-2, Yea; Motion that the Committee of the Whole rise, agreed to 239-66, No; Amendment to the substitute amendment to give the Agriculture Department the authority to block EPA decisions to ban or restrict the use of pesticides, rejected 167-175, Aye; Substitute amendment to extend the authorization for the act for one year through September 30, 1976, rejected 66-272, No; Amendment to require Agriculture Department approval for major EPA regulations and actions relating to pesticide control, rejected 164-233, Aye; Amendment to authorize EPA to approve state certification plans that require farmers to complete training programs before being certified to use restricted pesticides, as long as examinations were not required, adopted 250-155, Nay.

Final passage of the bill to authorize \$47.9-million for the act through September 30, 1976, passed 329-80, Nay; 10-9-75.

Conference report on the bill authorizing \$77.5-million to implement the act through March 31, 1977, agreed to 334-76, Nay; 11-18-75.

H.R. 5357 TOURIST TRAVEL APPROPRIATIONS

Final passage, a bill appropriating \$98.1 million through fiscal year '79 to Commerce Secretary for tourist promotion, passed 287-132, Yea; 5-13-75.

H.R. 8365 TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Amendment to prohibit the use of any appropriated funds for traffic control operations for supersonic transport planes landing or taking off at U.S. airports, rejected 196-214, No.

Final passage, a bill to provide fiscal '76 appropriations \$3,654,354,775 and advance fiscal '77 appropriations of \$90,059,000 for trans-

portation programs operated by the Department of Transportation and related agencies, passed 392-13, Aye; 7-10-75.

Motion to recommit to conference the conference report with specific instructions to insist that no funds be appropriated for certain railroad terminals, rejected 158-231, Nay; Motion to recede from its disagreement and concur in a Senate amendment to limit obligations for certain highway construction programs to \$9 billion for fiscal 1976 and the transition period, agreed to 297-95, Yea; 11-11-75.

H.R. 8597 TREASURY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Amendment to delete language prohibiting the Internal Revenue Service from denying tax-exempt status or the deductibility of charitable contributions to organizations, including private schools, that had failed to prove their policies were non-discriminatory, adopted 284-122, Aye; Amendment to reduce fiscal '76 funds for the Council on Wage and Price Stability from \$1.5 million to \$500,000, rejected 167-243, Aye; Amendment to prohibit the use of White House Office funds to pay employees detailed from any other government agencies for full-time service at the White House, rejected 141-274, No.

Final passage, a bill to provide fiscal '76 appropriations of \$6,265,532,152 for Treasury Postal Service and general government operations, passed 393-18, Yea; 7-17-75.

Conference report, provided for \$6,314,070,000 for fiscal '76, adopted 337-79, Yea; 7-30-75.

Motion that the House accept an amendment to appropriate \$5 million to the revolving fund for advance payments to the U.N. international air carriers instead of \$7 million as passed by the Senate, agreed to 217-199, Nay; 7-30-75.

H.R. 8835 TRUTH IN LENDING ACT

Final passage, a bill to require companies leasing consumer goods to disclose fully the terms and costs of the lease, passed 339-41, Not Voting; 10-28-75.

S. 846 EMBARGO ON ARMS TO TURKEY

Final passage, a bill to permit a partial resumption of shipments of U.S. arms to Turkey, rejected 206-223, Yea; 7-24-75.

S. 2230 ARMS EMBARGO AGAINST TURKEY

Amendment to permit delivery of arms contracted for by Turkey before Feb. 5, 1975, provided the President certified significant progress had been made on the refugee problem on Cyprus, rejected 187-229, Not Voting; Amendment to give Congress 60 days after the President reported to Congress on the Cyprus situation, as required by the bill, to stop, by concurrent resolution, the arms deliveries and sales authorized by the bill, rejected 190-223, Not Voting.

Final passage, a bill to authorize fiscal 1976 funds for the Board for International Broadcasting, including Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and to provide a partial lifting of the embargo on U.S. arms shipments to Turkey, passed 237-176, Not Voting; 10-2-75.

H.R. 6900 UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE EXTENSION ACT

Final passage, a bill to continue into 1976 emergency measures providing federally financed aid to workers who were ineligible for regular programs or who had used up a full year's benefits, passed 381-8, Yea; 5-21-75.

H. RES. 855 U.N. VOTE ON ZIONISM

Adoption of the resolution to condemn the United Nations' approval of a resolution classifying Zionism as a form of racism, adopted 384-0, Yea, 11-11-75.

S. 818 UN PEACEKEEPING FORCES

Final passage, a bill to authorize funds as necessary for the U.S. share of expenses of U.N. peacekeeping forces in the Middle East, passed 350-21, Not Voting; 6-9-75.

H.J. RES. 375 SUPPLEMENTAL VETERANS APPROPRIATIONS

Adoption of a joint resolution to appropriate \$638 million in additional funds for Veterans Administration programs, adopted 386-0, Yea; 4-15-75.

H.R. 10355 VETERANS AND SURVIVORS PENSION ADJUSTMENTS

Final passage, motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to provide an eight per cent increase in veterans' and survivors' pension rates, agreed to 400-0, Yea; 11-4-75.

S. 331 VETERANS DAY

Final passage, motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to designate commemoration of Veterans Day on Nov. 11, effective in 1978, instead of the current designation of the fourth Monday in October, agreed to 410-6, Yea; 9-9-75.

H.R. 7767 VETERANS DISABILITY

Final passage, a bill to provide increases in disability compensation rates for veterans of from six to ten percent and to provide increases in the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation of from 9.4 to 11.3 percent, agreed to 389-0, Yea; 6-16-75.

H.R. 8240 VETERANS, PHYSICIANS AND DENTIST COMPARABILITY PAY ACT

Final passage, a bill to allow the Veterans Administration to pay its doctors \$13,500 and dentists \$6,750 above the \$36,000 salary ceiling for other federal employees, agreed to under suspension 382-3, Yea; 7-21-75.

H.R. 9576 VETERANS READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS

Final passage, a bill to terminate veterans' education benefits for persons entering the military after Dec. 31, 1975, agreed to 298-106, Yea; 10-6-75.

H.R. 5675 VIETNAM AND CAMBODIA REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

Amendment to require President to report on refugee program every 30 days to House Judiciary and Senate Foreign Relations Committee rejected 158-261, No; Amendment to bar use of funds authorized by bill to assist refugees unless similar assistance was available to Americans facing same personal economic hardship, rejected 71-346, No; Amendment to authorize funds beyond 9-30-77, exclusively for education, rejected 80-237; Amendment to substitute \$507 million authorization for open-ended authorization, adopted 353-54, Aye.

Final passage, a bill authorizing \$507 million, passed 281-31, Yea; 5-14-75.

H.R. 6096 VIETNAM HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND EVACUATION PLAN

Amendment in form of substitute bill, to prohibit funds from being used by Democratic Republic of Vietnam or Viet Cong and to delete language providing funds in bill be distributed through international agencies, adopted 340-70, Aye; Amendment to add \$150 million for military assistance to South Vietnam, rejected 22-394, No; Amendment to add provision pointing out violations of Paris Peace Agreements by North Vietnamese and Viet Cong military forces, adopted 354-68, Aye; Amendment to clarify Congress' war powers and intent of bill, adopted 272-146, Aye; Amendment to restrict to 30 days after enactment of bill the period during which funds authorized could be used for U.S. armed forces participation in any evacuation of U.S. and foreign personnel from South Vietnam, rejected 196-208, No; Amendment to channel funds authorized for humanitarian assistance in S. Vietnam through U.N., rejected 200-200, No; Amendment to delete provision in bill waiving prohibitions in 5 public laws against use of funds for reintroduction of U.S. Armed Forces activities in Indochina, rejected 151-262, No; Amendment to establish a 10 day time limit to accomplish evacuation, rejected 97-311, No; Amendment to note the violations of

Paris Peace Agreement by North Vietnamese and Viet Cong, adopted 329-72. Aye; Amendment to prohibit use of funds for aid to North Vietnam or Provisional Revolutionary Government, adopted 343-71. Aye; Amendment to limit assistance to areas of South Vietnam not controlled by Communists, rejected 125-290. No.

Final passage, a bill authorizing \$507 million for humanitarian assistance and evacuation programs and to clarify restrictions for use of U.S. Armed Forces in evacuation, passed 230-187. Aye; 4-24-75.

Conference report, to authorize \$327 million in fiscal '75 funds to humanitarian and evacuation programs in South Vietnam and to authorize President to use U.S. troops in an evacuation of U.S. citizens and Vietnamese, rejected 162-246. Yea; 5-1-75.

H.R. 6219 VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Amendment to apply coverage of Voting Rights Act of '65 to jurisdictions where minority groups comprised more than five per cent of population and where less than 50% of minority voters cast ballots in the previous general elections to strengthen Justice Department authority to approve states' election laws and to extend those protections through '78, rejected 134-296. No; Amendment to exempt states and political subdivisions from provisions of the act provided (1) 60% of eligible voters and minority voters voted in the previous election, (2) the states took affirmative action to encourage participation of minority voters and (3) there were no violations of the Voting Rights Act for the previous five consecutive years, rejected 134-279. No; Amendment to replace a provision in the bill establishing a permanent ban on literacy tests with a provision adding a 10 year ban, rejected 89-318. Aye; Amendment to repeal provisions of the Voting Rights Act requiring states subject to the act to obtain prior approval of election law changes from the Justice Department, rejected 105-300. Aye; Amendment to delete Title II of the bill that would expand protections of the Voting Rights Act to Spanish-speaking Americans and other language minorities, rejected 104-264. Aye; Amendment to delete Alaskan natives from provisions requiring multilingual election materials for non-English speaking voters, rejected 145-264. Aye; Amendment to delete from the bill's definition of a language minority group those persons of ethnic origin whose dominant language was English, rejected 122-292. Aye; Amendment to insert "citizen" instead of "person" in language relating to conditions that prompted coverage under the Voting Rights Act, adopted 311-103. Aye; Amendment to expand the definition of the bill's language minority group to include all persons whose principal language was one other than English, rejected 156-253. No.

Final passage, a bill to extend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 through Aug. '85 and to expand the voting protections of the act to citizens of language minority groups, including citizens of Spanish heritage, Alaskan natives, Asian-Americans and American Indians, passed 341-70. Aye; 6-4-75.

H.R. 8731 WAGE AND PRICE STABILITY ACT

Amendment to strike provisions from the bill to give the Council on Wage and Price Stability power to require reports and subpoena business records on wages, costs and other information for all products sold, rejected 185-237. Aye.

Final passage, a bill to extend the Council on Wage and Price Stability through Sept. 30, 1977 and to give the Council power to require reports and subpoena business records on wages, costs, and other information for each product line, passed 235-188. Nay; 7-31-75.

H.R. 5608 WETLANDS LOAN ACT

Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to extend the Wetlands Loan Act of 1961

for seven years, and increase the total amount of authorized loans to \$200 million from \$105 million, agreed to under suspension, 400-0. Yea; 7-8-75.

H.R. 6706 WHITE HOUSE EMPLOYMENT AUTHORIZATION

Amendment to freeze the number of high-level White House staff jobs at the current level of 54 instead of increasing the authorization to 95 as provided by the bill, rejected 57-234. No; Amendment in the nature of a substitute bill, to provide control over the size of the White House staff through the congressional appropriations process instead of imposing statutory limits, rejected 146-242. Aye.

H.R. 5512 WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM

Final passage of the bill to require that all parts of the National Wildlife Refuge System be administered through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, passed 341-10. Yea, 11-14-75.

H.R. 9924 NATIONAL WOMEN'S CONFERENCE

Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize \$10 million for the organization and convening of a national women's conference in 1976, rejected 233-157. Nay, 10-20-75.

Final passage of the bill to authorize \$10 million for the organization and convening of a national women's conference in 1976, passed 252-162. Nay, 12-10-75.

AMERICA THE CYNICAL?

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, in this an election year, it is most disheartening to note that the public is growing more and more cynical toward their Government and their elected Representatives.

Watergate, the recent sex scandals, covert misuse of public funds, corruption, secrecy in Government, and heavy-handed Federal regulation have all combined to make the average citizen hypercritical, untrusting, and in many cases, reactionary toward politicians and government in general.

Honesty and high ethical standards seem to be the curing elixirs for this deadly deterioration in public opinion, and they are the recurring themes of nearly every national campaign today. Yet, the negative trend seems to be continuing, and we, as public officials, are suffering the inevitable consequences.

We in the legislative process are not alone in the general public's low esteem. A broad cross-section of America's professions and trades are generally indicted in recent public opinion polls. Is there a solution to this American malaise? The problem and a positive approach to reconcile our general climate of negativism has been appropriately offered by the Ely Daily Times editor, Mr. Rich Parker.

The message is well taken and I want to share these observations with all of my colleagues:

FAITH NEEDED

America is becoming a nation of cynics. A recent Gallup Poll indicates people have little belief in the "honesty" and "ethical standards" of those engaged in a variety of professions, including their representatives in Congress.

The respondents were asked to rate these two characteristics on a scale from very high to very low. Eleven professions were included.

The responses, which were limited to the percentage giving "very high" and "high" ratings, were revealing.

Medical doctors were the only group receiving these favorable ratings from a majority. Fifty-six per cent felt their standards were very high and high.

At the other end of the list, only 11 per cent had the same opinion of advertising executives.

Only 19 per cent of the respondents gave senators very high or high marks. Their colleagues in the House generated 14 per cent.

Other percentages included: Engineers, 48; college teachers, 44; journalists, 33; lawyers, 25; building contractors, 22; business executives, 19; and labor union leaders, 13.

The results should be disturbing to those in the professions surveyed and also anyone else in the hundreds of other professions and trades who deal with the public.

It is obvious Americans do not have much esteem in those they deal with. Put in layman's language, they often feel they're getting ripped off.

This feeling does little to promote goodwill, or inspire faith. Qualities which are integral necessities of our free enterprise system.

As a newspaper, we are dismayed to see only a third of the survey feel journalists are honest and possess very high or high ethical standards.

The media is a vital part of this nation's balance. It's the press who keeps a watchdog eye on government and brings to light both the good and the bad.

But its effectiveness is severely curtailed if the public has little belief in the honesty and ethics of those who gather and write the news. Readers will carry these views over into what they read and judge them accordingly.

It is not surprising the members of Congress were rated near the bottom. Faith in government is dangerously low and many who have been elected to responsible positions have failed to live up to the ideals of the office.

No sooner did Watergate fade into the background than the sex scandals made the headlines.

Faith is an important aspect of the human relationship.

For our society to function anywhere near optimum requires a strong bond of belief and faith among the stratum of the population.

It is imperative Americans work as individuals and as members of their professions and trades to restore the public's faith in their honesty and ethical standards.

Americans cannot build a strong future on cynicism.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY REPRESENTATIVE PIERRE S. DU PONT OF DELAWARE—MISSED VOTES

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) DU PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, on August 30, 31, and September 2, I had to return to Delaware on business and missed several recorded votes in the House. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

Rollcall No. 671, "aye."

Rollcall No. 674, "no."
 Rollcall No. 675, "aye."
 Rollcall No. 676, "aye."
 Rollcall No. 682, "no."
 Rollcall No. 683, "aye."
 Rollcall No. 684, "aye."
 Rollcall No. 691, "aye."
 Rollcall No. 692, "no."

LINE 21: THE DEAF'S CHANCE TO "HEAR"

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a column appeared in the Washington Post which I would like to share with my colleagues. The article was the combined work of Senators PATRICK LEAHY and CHARLES PERCY. Mr. LEAHY, a Democrat, and Mr. PERCY, a Republican, have joined forces to support the use of "Line 21"—the first nonvisual line above a TV picture—to send captions which allow those with hearing impairments to more fully enjoy television without affecting the sets of those of us fortunate enough to have good hearing.

As their column explains, the FCC is about to rule on the availability of Line 21 for "captioning." Making the line accessible for this use would help the 13.4 million Americans who have a serious hearing loss at a very reasonable cost to both the television industry and the consumer alike.

This is, indeed, a nonpartisan issue and one which I hope many of my colleagues in this Chamber will support. I want to thank the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Illinois for taking the lead on this issue and bringing it to our attention:

THE FATE OF LINE 21: WILL THE DEAF "HEAR" TV?

(By Patrick J. Leahy and Charles H. Percy)

Some time this fall, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) will make a decision that will be of great importance to the 13.4 million Americans who are deaf or whose hearing is seriously impaired.

The issue concerns the seemingly arcane question of the allocation of Line 21 on the television screen—the first non-visual line above your TV picture. But what the question really involves is whether we are willing to use available technology to maximize the enjoyment of television by the hearing impaired.

The Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) has been transmitting on Line 21 as part of a continuing series of experiments with "closed" captioning since 1972. "Closed" captioning refers to the process by which subtitles for television shows can be broadcast so that they are only visible on sets which have a special decoding device. Widespread use of such captioning would enable those with hearing problems to "hear" as well as see what is happening on their television screens.

The results of four years of experimentation with closed captioning have been an unqualified success. Aided by two grants from HEW, the Public Broadcasting Service installed decoding equipment at 12 test sites throughout the country. PBS broadcast a number of its most popular prime-time shows (most notably "Upstairs, Downstairs" and "The Adams Chronicles") with "closed"

captions. A nationwide survey of 1,400 viewers conducted by Gallaudet College here in Washington found that 94 per cent would purchase a home decoder if it were available.

The costs of closed captioning are relatively modest, particularly when compared with most expenses associated with television broadcasting. A network spends an average of \$270,000 to produce an hour of prime-time television programming and a broadcast quality video tape machine can run as much as \$140,000.

In contrast, PBS estimates that with the aid of a computer, it costs them less than \$1,000 to provide a complete set of captions for a 60-minute program. The only major expense is the captioning equipment itself which runs between \$25,000 and \$50,000—but this is a one-time cost. After interviewing several manufacturers, PBS estimates that home decoders could be marketed within a year at a cost of less than \$125. This means that most Americans with hearing problems could have access to captioning without undue financial hardship or government subsidy.

The FCC is determining the future of Line 21—and by implication "closed" captioning—because the Public Broadcasting Service petitioned the Commission last fall that Line 21 be available for captioning on a permanent, rather than experimental, basis. PBS argued that four years of experimentation had proven successful and that the commercial developers of decoders need some assurances that closed captioning has the full support of the FCC.

Given the history of closed captioning and its support by PBS and such groups as the National Association of the Deaf, one would assume that there would be little difficulty in securing FCC approval for the petition. But the PBS request became the center of controversy when the petition drew the opposition of all three commercial television networks.

The reasons for network opposition to allocating Line 21 for "closed" captioning are curious, since nothing in the petition would require them to provide "closed" captioning. It would merely make Line 21 available for transmitting captions by any network or station which chose to provide the service.

The networks offered a grab-bag of explanations for their objection to the permanent assignment of Line 21 to "closed" captioning. Some of the network arguments are simple to dismiss. For example, they contend that Line 21 should remain open for some unspecified future need. Since "closed" captioning would bring tangible benefits to more than 13 million Americans, it is difficult to imagine a more pressing future need, particularly since it is possible that Line 21 could be utilized in more than one way.

The networks also argue that successful captioning of many types of programming is not technologically possible. This is disputed by the record of the PBS experiments. They found that for many dramatic programs, such as "Upstairs, Downstairs," it is possible to project captions at a rate fast enough to reproduce virtually all the dialogue. For other types of programming, captioning can still convey the gist of what is happening without significant loss of content.

Because of this solid phalanx of opposition from the commercial networks, the future of "closed" captioning is very much in doubt. If the permanent allocation of Line 21 for "closed" captioning is granted by the FCC, it is likely that within two years 13 million Americans will be able to fully enjoy the television programming that so many of us have come to take for granted. However, if the FCC accedes to the network's wishes and postpones permanent assignment of Line 21, then a great opportunity to enhance the lives of those with hearing problems will be lost.

The FCC closed official comments on the PBS petition in May. But they have made clear that they are still willing to take cognizance of comments by individuals received after that date. While the FCC, like all regulatory agencies, does not base its decisions solely on the letters it receives, they do play an important role in alerting the commission to the feelings of the general public and particularly the feelings of those who will suffer from a missed opportunity if the petition is denied.

One of the most encouraging developments in recent years has been the government's growing sensitivity to the problems of the handicapped. It would therefore be both ironic and rather cruel if the FCC did not take positive steps to encourage the development of a system which promises to allow the hearing impaired to fully enjoy television.

THE ARAB BOYCOTT AND AMERICAN BUSINESS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee formally released its report, "The Arab Boycott and American Business." Our report culminates nearly 1½ years of investigations to determine if existing laws suitably prevent American businesses from participation in restrictive trade practices, and to recommend changes in the laws where needed.

The investigation was considered at the request of Members of Congress who believed the Department of Commerce, under the authority granted to it in the Export Administration Act, was not satisfactorily enforcing the antiboycott provisions of the act. At the time we decided to initiate the investigation, reports revealed a tenfold increase in the number of firms added to the Arab League's "blacklist."

Our task was difficult, and became exacerbated by Secretary Morton's 4-month refusal to furnish copies of "boycott reports" filed with the Department of Commerce over the past 5 years. After much deliberation, the subcommittee cited the Secretary for contempt of Congress, and finally, one day before the matter was to be raised before the full committee, the Secretary released the documents.

The staff and members of the subcommittee examined over 30,000 reports, questioned the Secretary, and concluded that—

Through a variety of practices, the Commerce Department actually served to encourage boycott practices, implicitly by condoning activity declared against national policy or simply by looking the other way while these practices grew.

By the time Congress started to reexamine U.S. participation in the Arab boycott—more than 10 years after it initially condemned the boycott—billions of dollars in U.S. sales were affected by restrictive trade practices. The report points out that the Department took responsibility for promulgating vague and

ambiguous reporting requirements; for distributing trade notices which contained boycott demands to American businesses; and for including language on their reporting forms which specifically stated that U.S. exporters are "not legally prohibited from taking any action" in support of the Arab boycott.

In light of these revelations, the subcommittee adopted recommendations to change the law so that there would be no question about congressional disapproval of the boycott, the United States response to it, and in particular making illegal participation by any U.S. national or company.

I lend my full support to the report, and to legislation to carry out its recommendations. I signed the 1965 report to extend the Export Control Act, and remain firmly committed to outlawing any U.S. participation in or collaboration with the boycott.

We are a government of ideals—ideals which include free trade, freedom of association, and freedom of religion.

Collaboration with the Arab boycott by the U.S. Government and toleration of citizen participation in it are repugnant to these ideals, and cannot be tolerated by a free society.

EUROPE'S NUCLEAR TURN

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, during the recent House debate over the Nuclear Fuel Assurance Act, H.R. 8401, great concern was expressed by several Members that the U.S. nuclear program is in serious danger of lagging behind that of our European competitors. Especially prominent in this argument was the supposed need, which several members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy cited, for ever-increasing supplies of nuclear fuel for those European nations which are expanding their nuclear power generating capabilities.

Yet, as an excellent editorial in the August 26 New York Times notes:

The Paris-based Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development has revised downward by about 20 percent its estimates for 1985 nuclear energy output in its 23 member nations, a level lower than predicted before the oil embargo.

I commend to my colleagues' attention the thoughtful Times' piece which follows:

EUROPE'S NUCLEAR TURN

West Europe's lack of fossil fuel sources and its heavy dependence on Mideast oil led most countries there to step up plans for nuclear energy expansion even more than the United States in the wake of the 1973-74 embargo and five-fold oil price increase. But economic factors and public concern over safety, the environment, and weapons proliferation now have led to a slowdown similar to that in the United States.

The Paris-based Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development has revised downward by about 20 percent its estimates for 1985 nuclear energy output in its 23 member nations, a level lower than that predicted before the oil embargo.

Mass demonstrations, scientific debate, reduced energy demand, lack of capital and difficulty in securing sites are even bringing a re-evaluation of the much-touted French lead in fast-breeder technology, the plutonium-fueled reactor once seen as Europe's chosen instrument to capture American-dominated export markets, starting in the 1990's. A new French-West German joint development pact for the plutonium breeder with an eye on third-country markets is being described by some Common Market experts as "another Concorde"—the British-French supersonic passenger plane that, after vast subsidies and delays, still faces a highly uncertain commercial future.

MASSIVE PROTESTS

Thousands of demonstrators from France and neighboring countries clashed with police near Lyons last month while protesting the construction site chosen for France's Super-Phoenix, planned as the world's first large commercial fast breeder. Britain has ordered a five-month restudy of its breeder plans and the staggering problems that would be posed by the worldwide spread of plutonium, one of the most poisonous—and explosive—substances known to man.

What concerns scientists and other nuclear experts most is the double nature of plutonium, a nuclear reactor waste that does not exist in nature. It can be re-used not only as a civilian reactor fuel, but as little as 10 to 20 lbs. can be made relatively easily into a Hiroshima-sized atom bomb. In contrast, the 2 to 4 percent enriched uranium used in the American-designed light water reactor cannot be exploded.

UNACCEPTABLE RISK

Sir Brian Flowers, chairman of Britain's Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution and one of Europe's leading scientists, recently warned his countrymen that the fast breeder was "a billion-pound step down a technological path which may later prove unacceptable or even catastrophic."

The West German and French governments are still officially committed to the plutonium route. But, during the past year, their approval of sales to Brazil and Pakistan of reprocessing plants that separate plutonium explosive from spent reactor fuel rods has aroused growing concern about nuclear proliferation in the United States Congress and, belatedly, in the Ford Administration.

With public concern now growing in West Europe, chances are improved for American efforts to win supplier agreement on embargo of plutonium reprocessing plants. That would help pin down the agreement of third world countries, such as Iran and Pakistan, to ship their spent fuel rods back to supplier countries in exchange for safe uranium fuel, rather than to engage in dangerous plutonium extraction at home.

TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA SUPPORTS DINGELL-BROYHILL (TRAIN) AUTO EMISSION AMENDMENT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Record the letter of support I have received from Mr. Paul J. Tierney, president, Transportation Association of America, and its board of directors, for the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) auto emission control amendment to be offered to the pending Clean Air Act amendments, H.R. 10498.

Enclosed with the letter is the listing of the representatives of numerous nationwide companies and organizations who make up the TAA's board of directors. I urge the attention of my colleagues to this message and support for the amendment:

TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION

OF AMERICA,

Washington, D.C., August 27, 1976.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Just recently the Board of Directors of the Transportation Association of America (see current roster attached) adopted the following policy, which we believe is applicable to the current consideration of H.R. 10498, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1976:

"TAA supports the concept that a positive benefit/economic cost analysis should be determined by legislative bodies and regulatory agencies prior to the enactment of laws or the promulgation of regulations pertaining but not limited to the movement of persons or things."

TAA is an organization of transportation interests of all types who work together to develop national policy positions that are aimed at establishing and maintaining the strongest possible U.S. transportation system under private-enterprise principles. Its members—like its 115-member Board—consist of transport users, suppliers, investors, and carriers of all modes whose interests encompass all forms of freight and passenger transport.

While we have been very selective in urging application of the above broad policy position, we consider it particularly relevant to those portions of H.R. 10498 that propose new auto emission standards. In our judgment, the public benefits that will result from imposition of these standards will be far exceeded by the costs. We also understand that the modified standards proposed by Representatives Dingell and Broyhill will yield air quality benefits essentially comparable to those expected from the standards contained in H.R. 10498.

In brief, our reasons for supporting the Dingell-Broyhill amendment are as follows:

Several independent and impartial studies by recognized authorities have concluded that auto emission standards have reached the point where further tightening will create costs far in excess of benefits.

A joint EPA-FEA-DOT analysis of H.R. 10498 concludes it would result in a waste of energy, would provide negligible air quality benefits, increase consumer costs, and discourage technological innovation.

Current standards, according to a minority report of members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, have already reduced hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide emissions by 83 percent, and nitrous oxides by 40 percent, when compared to pre-1968 uncontrolled levels.

The more stringent auto emission standards are made, costs will escalate rapidly; i.e., the EPA-FEA-DOT analysis concludes that adoption of H.R. 10498 standards, as compared to the Dingell-Broyhill standards, will cost consumers billions of dollars and billions of gallons of fuel.

The imposition of unduly strict auto emission standards is inconsistent with the objectives sought by the Congress in encouraging conservation of petroleum, because fuel inefficiency increases as standards stiffen.

The tightening of auto emission standards, as proposed in H.R. 10498, is in conflict with existing auto-fuel-efficiency standards now set by law, and compliance with both, according to auto builders, is an impossibility.

Continuously changing auto pollution standards, according to the American Automobile Association and the EPA have made it extremely difficult for auto mechanics to

maintain vehicles and to learn required new techniques.

The adoption of H.R. 10498 standards will result in higher purchase and maintenance costs of new automobiles, which will encourage the retention by consumers of older, high-polluting autos that should be scrapped.

Because of the major impact of the auto industry on the nation's economy, (auto and related expenses represent nearly 10% of the GNP), care should be exercised before imposing changes that can cause very serious disruptions.

TAA believes, as stated by the President, that the Dingell/Broyhill amendment "best balances the critical considerations of energy, economics and environment." We urge that you take the practical and constructive approach to this legislation by favoring this amendment.

Sincerely,

PAUL J. TIERNEY.

Attachment.

TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA— BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Henry A. Correa, Chairman, President, ACF Industries, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Paul J. Tierney, President, Transportation Association of America, Washington, D.C.

Stephen Alles, President, Association of American Railroads, Washington, D.C.

Harold L. Albrecht, Vice President, Reynolds Metals Co., Richmond, Va.

A. G. Anderson, Transportation Association of America, New York, N.Y.

Grant Arnold, General Traffic Manager, Ethyl Corporation, Baton Rouge, La.

George P. Baker, James J. Hill Professor of Transportation Emeritus, Harvard Business School, Boston, Mass.

Frank E. Barnett, Chairman, Board of Directors, Chief Executive Officer, Union Pacific Railroad Company, New York, N.Y.

W. J. Barta, Chairman, The Valley Line Company, St. Louis, Mo.

Henry Bartholomay III, Senior Vice President, Alexander & Alexander, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

Theodore V. Brooks, Senior Vice President, The Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, N.Y.

Curtis D. Buford, President, Trailer Train Company, Chicago, Ill.

J. L. Burke, Attorney at Law, Tulsa, Okla.

Vincent C. Burke, Jr., Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, The Riggs National Bank of Washington, D.C., Washington, D.C.

William E. Callahan, Executive Vice President, International Harvester Co., Chicago, Ill.

Walter F. Carey, Chairman of the Board, Janesville Auto Transport, TIME-DC Dealers Transit, Lansing, Ill.

Edward E. Carlson, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, UAL, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

H. T. Chilton, President and Chief Executive Officer, Colonial Pipeline Co., Atlanta, Ga.

Thomas T. Church, Vice President, Transportation, Bethlehem Steel Corp., Bethlehem, Pa.

Lee Cisneros, Director of Physical Distribution, The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

William H. Clausen, President, Acme Fast Freight, Inc., Lake Success, N.Y.

Joseph A. Cooper, Senior Vice President-Marketing, Delta Air Lines, Inc., Atlanta, Ga.

John A. Creedy, President, Water Transport Association, New York, N.Y.

Robert H. Cutler, Chairman of the Board, Illinois-California Express, El Paso, Tex.

Thomas E. Darnton, Vice President—Procurement and Production Control, General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.

John E. Drick, Chairman of the Executive Committee, The First National Bank of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

N. C. Dunn, Traffic Manager, Supply Department, Exxon Co., U.S.A., Houston, Tex.

J. Donald Durand, General Counsel, Association of Oil Pipe Lines, Washington, D.C.

William M. Fairhurst, Senior Vice President—Administration and Planning, Dana Corp., Toledo, Ohio.

Peter Fanchi, Jr., President, Federal Barge Lines, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.

John P. Fishwick, President and Chief Executive Officer, Norfolk & Western Railway Co., Roanoke, Va.

Carl J. Fleps, Vice President—Government Relations, The Greyhound Corp., Washington, D.C.

Sam H. Flint, Vice President—Corporate Operations, The Quaker Oats Co., Chicago, Ill.

Charles W. L. Foreman, Vice President, United Parcel Service, Greenwich, Conn.

Welby M. Frantz, Member of the Board, Eastern Express, Inc., Terre Haute, Ind.

Gayton E. Germane, Professor of Logistics, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

David E. Gile, Senior Vice President, Marine Midland Bank, New York, N.Y.

G. Zan Golden, Senior Vice President, North American Van Lines, Inc., Fort Wayne, Ind.

Allan Grant, President, American Farm Bureau Federation, Park Ridge, Ill.

R. C. Grayson, Chairman and President, St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co., St. Louis, Mo.

Donald G. Griffin, Vice President—Traffic and Transportation, PPG Industries, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Frank L. Grimm, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, O'Boyle Tank Lines, Rockville, Md.

Harold F. Hammond, Senior Adviser, Transportation Association of America, Washington, D.C.

E. P. Hardin, President, Mobil Pipe Line Co., Dallas, Tex.

John E. Harris, Jr., Vice President, Petroleum Supply Division, Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

Richard Haupt, Director, Transportation and Traffic Office, Supply Staff, Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

Frank L. Heard, Jr., General Counsel, Exxon Pipeline Co., Houston, Tex.

Robert M. Hendrickson, Executive Vice President and Chief Investment Officer, The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, New York, N.Y.

J. W. Hershey, Chairman of the Board, American Commercial Lines, Inc., Houston, Tex.

Richard D. Hill, Chairman of the Board, The First National Bank of Boston, Boston, Mass.

Eugene Holland, Jr., Executive Vice President, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

J. Robert Hoon, General Manager of Transportation, Aluminum Company of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.

John F. Horner, Vice president—Refining Transportation and Engineering, Amoco Oil Co., Chicago, Ill.

Paul R. Ignatius, President, Air Transport Association of America, Washington, D.C.

George P. Jenkins, Chairman of the Board and Chairman of the Finance Committee Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, New York, N.Y.

William B. Johnson, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, IC Industries, Chicago, Ill.

John M. Kinnaird, Vice President—Government Relations, American Trucking Associations, Inc., Washington, D.C.

A. Carl Kotchian, Los Angeles, Calif.

Jack R. Kruienza, President, Union Tank Car Co., Chicago, Ill.

Richard A. Lempert, Vice President and General Counsel, American Airlines, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Edwin A. Locke, Jr., President, American Paper Institute, New York, N.Y.

Clark MacGregor, Vice President, United Technologies Corp., Washington, D.C.

Frank H. Madden, Vice President, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., New York, N.Y.

James C. Malone, Vice President, Union Carbide Corp., New York, N.Y.

James J. McNulty, Chairman of the Board, Emery Air Freight Corp., Wilton, Conn.

F. A. Mechling, President, Union Mechling Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Louis W. Menk, Chairman of the Board, Burlington Northern Inc., St. Paul, Minn.

Frank L. Merwin, Vice President, ASARCO Inc., New York, N.Y.

Thomas A. Micall, President, Pullman Trillmobile, Chicago, Ill.

G. Russell Moir, Chairman of the Board and President, Transway International Corp., New York, N.Y.

Giles Morrow, General Counsel, Freight Forwarders Institute, New York, N.Y.

James F. Morse, Seattle, Wash.

Edwin F. Mundy, Vice President—Traffic, Nabisco, Inc., East Hanover, N.J.

John A. Murphy, Chief Executive Officer, Gateway Transportation Co., Inc., La Crosse, Wis.

W. L. Nahrang, President and Chief Executive Officer, Johnson Motor Lines, Inc., Charlotte, N.C.

Frank A. Nemec, President, Lykes Corp., New Orleans, La.

D.H. Overmyer, Chairman of the Board, D. H. Overmyer Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.

Adrian B. Palmer, Chairman, Rollins Burdick Hunter Co., Chicago, Ill.

Michael Papadopoulos, General Manager, Transportation and Distribution, Shell Oil Co., Houston, Tex.

V. L. Petersen, Vice President, The Good-year Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

John E. Phelan, General Traffic Manager, Anheuser-Busch, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.

Robert W. Prescott, President, The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.

Larry S. Provo, President, Chicago & North Western Transportation Co., Chicago, Ill.

William J. Quinn, Chairman of the Board, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., Chicago, Ill.

C. B. Ramsdell, Vice President—Group Executive Transportation Systems Group, Westinghouse Air Brake Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

John S. Reed, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., Chicago, Ill.

James E. Reinke, Vice President—Government Affairs, Eastern Air Lines, Inc., Washington, D.C.

James J. Reynolds, President, American Institute of Merchant Shipping, Washington, D.C.

W. Thomas Rice, Chairman of the Board, Seaboard Coast Line Railroad Co., Jacksonville, Fla.

Mark D. Robeson, Executive Vice President, Yellow Freight System, Inc., Shawnee Mission, Kans.

J. R. Scanlin, Vice President of the Board, GATX Corp., Chicago, Ill.

Henry E. Seyfarth, Seyfarth, Shaw, Fairweather & Geraldson, Chicago, Ill.

W. K. Smith, Vice President, General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.

Wilbur S. Smith, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Wilbur Smith and Associates, Columbia, S.C.

Lée R. Sollenbarger, Chairman of the Board, Transcon Lines, Los Angeles, Calif.

William I. Spencer, President, Citibank, New York, N.Y.

Edwin F. Stadelman, General Traffic Manager, J. C. Penney Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.

W. Stanhaus, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Spector Industries, Inc., Bensenville, Ill.

Robert L. Stone, Chairman and President, The Hertz Corp., New York, N.Y.

Stoney M. Stubbs, Chairman of the Board, Frozen Food Express, Inc., Dallas, Tex.

Robert E. Thomas, Chairman and President, MAPCO Inc., Tulsa, Okla.

George F. Tidmarsh, Vice President, Physical Distribution Department, Sears, Roebuck and Co., Chicago, Ill.

Stuart G. Tipton, Senior Vice President—

Federal Affairs, Pan American World Airways, Inc., Washington, D.C.

John L. Tormey, Chairman, Roadway Express, Inc., Akron, Ohio.

Kenneth L. Vore, Vice President-Traffic and Transportation, United States Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Charles J. Waidlich, President, Cities Service Co., Tulsa, Okla.

Michael J. Walsh, Jr., Vice President-Transportation and Distribution, St. Regis Paper Co., New York, N.Y.

William F. Ward, Vice President and Representative, Bank of America, Teheran, Iran.

Hays T. Watkins, Chairman of the Board and President, The Chessie System, Cleveland, Ohio.

Charles A. Webb, President, National Association of Motor Bus Owners, Washington, D.C.

William G. White, Chairman of the Board, Consolidated Freightways, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.

Bennett C. Whitlock, Jr., President-Elect, American Trucking Associations, Inc., Washington, D.C.

George K. Whitney, Consultant, Massachusetts Financial Services, Inc., Boston, Mass.

William C. Whittemore, Senior Vice President and Treasurer, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.

REDUCING GOVERNMENT SPENDING RATED TOP PRIORITY IN POLL OF COUGHLIN CONSTITUENTS

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my yearly practice, I am presenting to my colleagues the results of my mail questionnaire poll to constituents of Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District.

The annual poll has provided another forum in which citizens can express their views on issues national and international. The format permits a diversity of answers through ranking questions, opinion queries and "yes-no" responses.

In the important economy field, constituents rated reducing Government spending as the top priority from among a choice of five alternatives. Ranked last was creating Government jobs.

While reducing Government spending was rated as the first priority, respondents were less willing to "bite the bullet" as to where spending should be slashed. A majority said the same amount or more money should be spent in such areas as defense, education, aid to the elderly, public transportation, environmental protection and health care.

Again, foreign aid was singled out by most for cuts.

In a broad-ranging question on our accomplishments as a nation in its first 200 years, my constituents most frequently cited our tradition of freedom and the maintenance of our form of government.

Following the pattern of the past 2 years, inflation was listed as the most important domestic issue confronting us. Communism and Soviet expansionism rated as the most important international issue.

A plurality of constituents felt that Government regulations to benefit the consumer, the worker, and the environment substantially affected the price of goods.

Almost three-quarters of those responding back the FBI and CIA despite revelations of past abuses.

In answering "yes-no" questions, my constituents indicated support for continuing the policy of détente, and limiting distribution of food stamps to families earning below the current national poverty level for a family of four.

Those answering were split over the issue of deregulating wellhead prices for oil and gas with 46 percent favoring that approach.

Clear-cut opposition was registered against reversing the 1972 Supreme Court decision by passing a constitutional amendment that would prohibit all abortions, against the Humphrey-Hawkins proposal to make the Federal Government the employer of last resort to guarantee jobs, against the Federal Government becoming involved in financing New York City or any local government which cannot meet its financial obligations, and against enacting legislation to permit citizens to register to vote simply by mailing a postcard.

A total of 10,790 individual responses met the July 31, 1976, deadline. Many others were received after that date, but could not be included in the tabulation.

My staff weighted the responses by ZIP code to insure the accuracy of the answers. This procedure—used in compiling previous results—showed again that there was virtually no difference in sentiment from both the Montgomery County and Philadelphia areas of my congressional district.

The questionnaires were mailed to all households, apartments, and boxholders in the district to give as many individuals as possible the opportunity to participate in the poll. In following my customary practice, I will be mailing results to them on the same basis.

I also will be submitting the results to the President and his staff.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

1. As the United States celebrates its Bicentennial, Americans contemplate our strengths and weaknesses in a rapidly-changing world.

A. What do you consider to be our Nation's greatest achievement in its first 200 years?

[In percent]

Freedom, liberty	18
Maintenance of Constitution, form of government	15
Technological achievements	13
Standard of living	7
Others, education, world role, generosity, etc.	47

B. Specify briefly the most important domestic issue confronting us.

[In percent]

Inflation	30
Unemployment	11
Government corruption	7
Crime	6
Union power, busing, taxes, etc.	46

C. Specify briefly the most important international issue confronting us.

[In percent]

Communism or Soviet expansionism	21
Mid-East situation	17
Foreign entanglements	9

Arms race, nuclear proliferation..... 5
Third World, Africa, Panama Canal..... 48
2. In dealing with the economy, please rank in order of priority, 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, any actions which you think we should be taking.

[In order of priority]

Reducing government spending	1
Cutting individual tax rates	2
Providing private sector incentives	3
Building public works projects	4
Creating government jobs programs	5

3. Should we spend more, less or the same amount of your Federal tax dollars as presently on the following:

[In percent]

	More	Same	Less
Education	36	42	22
Aid to elderly	51	41	8
Environmental protection	38	39	23
Foreign aid	2	19	79
Defense	26	39	35
Public transportation	56	28	16
Aid to the poor	19	47	34
Health care	43	39	18

4. Which of the following has had the most adverse effect on the country. Please rank 1, 2 and 3.

[In order of adverse effect]

Big Labor	1
Big Government	2
Big Corporations	3

5. Do you feel that government regulations to benefit the consumer, the worker and the environment affect the prices of goods? (one only)

[In percent]

Substantially	45
Moderately	37
Slightly	18

6. Which best expresses your feelings about the FBI and CIA? (one only)

[In percent]

They have grossly exceeded their jurisdictions and should be completely overhauled	24
There have been abuses which should be rectified, but the majority of their activities are necessary and desirable	53
With minor exceptions, they have been doing what they should	21
Other (specify)	2

7. On balance, do you believe that the policy of détente should be pursued

[In percent]

Yes	54
No	28
Undecided	18

8. Despite possible price increases, do you feel that deregulation of oil and gas wellhead prices is necessary to stimulate domestic production and reduce dependence on imported fuels?

[In percent]

Yes	46
No	35
Undecided	19

9. Should food stamps be issued only to families earning below the current national poverty level of \$5,000 for a family of four?

[In percent]

Yes	71
No	21
Undecided	8

10. Regardless of cost, should the Federal Government guarantee jobs as the employer of last resort to maintain unemployment of less than three percent?

[In percent]

Yes	19
No	74
Undecided	7

11. Would you favor reversing the 1972 Supreme Court decision by passing a Constitutional Amendment that would prohibit all abortions?

[In percent]

Yes ----- 18
 No ----- 76
 Undecided ----- 6

12. Should the Federal Government become involved in financing New York City or any local government which cannot meet its financial obligations?

[In percent]

Yes ----- 20
 No ----- 67
 Undecided ----- 13

13. Would you approve of a new law to permit citizens to register to vote simply by mailing a postcard?

[In percent]

Yes ----- 26
 No ----- 69
 Undecided ----- 5

Party preference of those responding.

[In percent]

Republican ----- 58
 Democrat ----- 23
 Non-partisan ----- 16
 Other ----- 3

Ages of those responding.

[In percent]

18 to 21 ----- 2
 21 to 35 ----- 23
 35 to 50 ----- 26
 50 to 65 ----- 31
 65 and over ----- 18

THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress who has sworn to support and defend our Constitution, I have an enduring commitment to protect the rights and civil liberties that the Founding Fathers claimed for every American. Today, as much as any time in our Nation's history, we must recognize the genius of a constitutional system that guarantees each individual freedom from the tyrannies of government.

The Bill of Rights remains the single most forceful statement of human liberty that the world has ever known. Through the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, Americans are secure in their right to free expression and their right to due process under law. It is the obligation of every citizen to vigilantly guard against any infringement of those rights.

In recent years, the constitutional protection of the right to bear arms has come under question and attack. Those who favor the enactment of Federal gun controls have sought to dismiss the provisions of the second amendment by suggesting that the Founding Fathers did not intend to give each law-abiding citizen "the right to keep and bear arms." I do not personally agree with this interpretation of the second amendment. In this case—like any other involving the Bill of Rights—I side with Justice Black in his statement that:

The unqualified prohibitions laid down by the framers were intended to give liberty . . . the broadest scope that could be countenanced by an orderly society.

In an article examining the meaning

of the second amendment, Jonathan A. Weiss makes a cogent argument that the framers of our Constitution meant exactly what they said when they provided for the right to bear arms. I share Mr. Weiss' concern about those who would degrade the Bill of Rights by reading its provisions in "bits and pieces" for short-term political ends. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the gun control issue will read Mr. Weiss' thoughtful presentation, and for that reason I include it in the RECORD:

A REPLY TO ADVOCATES OF GUN-CONTROL LAW*

I. INTRODUCTION

The great stumbling block for those who want to lead us on a path toward governmental prohibition of gun ownership—prohibition that excepts a special government-approved few, for not many suggest that all guns everywhere be banned—is the Constitution. The second amendment emphatically proclaims that the government may not inhibit the citizens' right to bear arms: "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." This is one of the few references to a "right" in the first eight amendments of the Bill of Rights, e.g., the first amendment prohibits certain congressional action and grants a right only for assembly.

Many try to use the first part of the second amendment to dismiss the amendment as a whole. Four arguments are commonly made: (1) that individuals bearing arms are not militia and, therefore, are not included; (2) that any militia that might be said to exist among the people is not "well regulated" and therefore, only government-supervised persons, like police, National Guard and other branches of the armed forces, qualify as "the people" to whom the amendment applies; (3) that political differences between two centuries ago and now render the second amendment obsolete, because we are no longer faced with a standing army of British troops on American soil; and (4) technological differences between then and now destroy the amendment's meaning, since one handgun or thousands of handguns—or knives, or rifles, or bazookas—would not stop a Russian ICBM.

These arguments all begin from an unexamined premise: that the Constitution and its Bill of Rights can be read in bits and pieces so that each provision becomes a discrete passage. Such a reading of the first amendment would have legislators proclaiming that individual states can pass laws abridging freedom of speech, since the amendment ties its prohibitions of government action to Congress. Such a reading would also require a finding that there is no constitutional requirement to allow bail, since the eighth amendment is connected only with "excessive bail."

This "interpretation," regarding each provision separately and as a simple sum of words and qualifiers, rises from a disregard of the Constitution as the founding document of America's system of government. The tendency to regard the Constitution as a collection of unrelated edicts often exists in tandem with another narrow view. This latter view regards the Constitution as, in general, an expedient document in its time

without the broad principles that define a concept of relationships among men.

Justice Black, in *Bridges v. California*, states that amendments are to be read in the broadest possible scope:

"[T]he only conclusion supported by history is that the unqualified prohibitions laid down by the framers were intended to give liberty . . . the broadest scope that could be countenanced by an orderly society."

Using this statement as a hypothesis, we may work toward another, more reasonable, method of constitutional interpretation.

The amendments refer to and have changed the whole of the Constitution. The amendments supersede anything in the main document that they contradict and, of course, they override common law antecedents, just as the Constitution's main body does. As additions, the amendments become integral parts of the entire document and interrelate with other amendments and provisions so as to produce a total and a unified effect. The amendments were not intended as separate and distinct entities, but rather to be taken in their entirety to achieve an integrated purpose. Considering this, it is possible to develop a more reasonable method of constitutional interpretation than was applied in "Shooting to Kill the Handgun: Time to Martyr Another American 'Hero.'"

The amendments in the Bill of Rights define limits on the government's power to sanction or regulate the affairs of citizens. Further, they reflect a concept of natural rights, such as is stated in our first fundamental document, the Declaration of Independence. The amendments are meant to be read together and many contain implicit references to other amendments. They collectively determine the limits within which government power to sanction or regulate the affairs of citizens must operate.

It appears logical that the amendments had an essential purpose to convey more meaning and spirit than a narrow, or "statutory," interpretation would reveal. Under a model of this nature, the intended meaning of the amendments could be extended beyond the verbal realm to include movies and symbolic expression, while the army could represent any branch of the armed forces. This approach is perfectly legitimate since, realistically, the Constitution sets up broad categories which can tolerate changes in application. Justice Black noted:

"[I]t is true that [the amendments] were designed to meet ancient evils. But they are the same kind of human evils that have emerged from century to century wherever excessive power is sought by a few at the expense of the many."

* * * [T]he people of no nation can lose their liberty so long as a Bill of Rights like ours survives and its basic purposes are conscientiously interpreted, enforced and respected so as to afford continuous protection against old, as well as new, devices and practices which might thwart these purposes."

In short, an interpretation such as the one in "Shooting to Kill" is inappropriate, because the particular applications which the Founders had in mind are subordinate, if not irrelevant, and should yield to the principles and the spirit involved.

It is not hard to conclude that the language of the second amendment means what it says, changing only with respect to its particular application. For this reason, it is clear that gun-control advocates attempting to reinterpret the second amendment into a noneffective status are essentially attempting to defeat the meaning and purpose of the amendment. Gun-control advocates who argue that they can determine which provision of the Constitution will or will not be enforced, essentially frustrate "the great design of a written Constitution."

*Jonathan A. Weiss in *Journal of Urban Law*, v. 52, Winter 1974:577-589. Reprinted by permission of the *Journal of Urban Law*, University of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan. Mr. Weiss is Director, Legal Services for the Elderly Poor, New York, N.Y.; B.A. 1960, Yale University; LL.B., 1963 Yale University.

II. THE SECOND AMENDMENT IN CONTEXT

If the first ten amendments do, indeed, represent a doctrine of natural law or a protection of fundamental rights, it would seem logical that each amendment should recognize, implicitly or explicitly, some inviolable right in addition to stating some specific prohibitions against government infringement on that right. The second amendment demonstrates this proposition. It grants the individual right to bear arms and restricts government infringement on that right.

The main body of the Constitution grants to Congress the power to organize, arm and discipline militia. This creates rights for government. The second amendment secures individual liberty and gives another dimension to war power. Perhaps anticipating the argument that armies would make individual means of self-protection useless and/or dangerous, the Framers amended that grant of power to make explicit that the Constitution was not intended to infringe on "the right of the people to keep and bear Arms * * *"; rather, this right would help secure such a militia. This stands to reason, since it had been chiefly the gun-bearing individual who assisted in the fight for independence, was responsible for its success and, hence, made possible the Constitution.

It remains to be proven that such a rationale of individual protection against state militia is not even more valid today than when the Bill of Rights was written. Also, it may help to secure a militia.

What the psychological, military and societal effects are on a citizenry bearing arms is certainly a factual and policy issue, on both a society-building level and in present appraisal. We cannot say as pure fact that providing people freedoms to keep and bear arms does not help build an army when needed. Among the elements to be considered in this respect is that there is no clear and convincing proof that the right to bear arms does not act as a deterrent to either domestic or foreign aggression. Therefore, since the amendment provides this freedom and there is no clear and convincing evidence of its need for repeal, it should not be interpreted into nonexistence.

Considering the amendments as commands and absolutes further reinforces this viewpoint of the second amendment. A command's focus is on its effects of sanctifying and protecting, not upon the reasons for its consequent protections. Commands are absolutes. They are not reducible to their justifications. If the amendment in question is one of the Bills of Rights, it must be read as commanding certain societal absolutes and preventing the state from intruding on the enjoyment of those absolute rights. As Congress may not quell printing presses or deny juries, it may not deny guns if the language in one amendment is as commanding as the other. To accept the amendments in that fundamental document as societal bases and a fundamental and constitutionally protected right.

III. STATE POWER

The safeguards and assumptions expressed in the Constitution establish a doctrine of criminal law. Through government, this doctrine is employed to sanction, restrain and occasionally, attempt to rehabilitate those who, if we did not, would act in ways that would tangibly affect the freedom of others. We immobilize a man who steals a car so the car owner may be mobile, but we leave alone a child who upsets another by not saluting a flag. We look to inhibit those who commit inhibiting acts on another's freedom.

To guard against the potential abuses of this criminal law doctrine, the Constitution also created a presumption of the innocence of the individual. This presumption stems philosophically from the concept of free will. It appears to flow logically, then, that we

punish only for acts, not for ideas, things or acts that create tendencies to act. Here the connection among amendments is even more clear. Ideas can incite as well as excite. Men loose on ball may be more dangerous than those caged on suspicion. Yet, because of the constitutional protections, factors associated with prohibited acts, even casually associated, cannot be prohibited.

Guns in fact elude the classification of precursors more so than most other examples. That is, a person must be legally intoxicated before he can be convicted of drunken driving and a person must be elected to office before he can be impeached. However, guns are only one means employed in crimes and most of the crimes committed through the use of guns could be committed with some other weapon. Yet despite the obvious fact that guns are not absolute precursors, they seem, more frequently than other factors associated with crime, to be the target of reformers.

Gun-control advocates often argue that guns are the link between the psychological tendency and the actual criminal conduct. However, they fail to realize or address themselves to the fact that the mere possession of guns does not affect the user's free will or his decisionmaking process, as alcohol, heroin or even free speech may. They do not detract from the exercise of mind protected by the first amendment, nor do they interfere with the model of man posited by this analysis. Rather, the choice to possess guns simply makes it possible to choose to use guns in a legal or an illegal context—or not to use them at all.

Seen in this perspective, the second amendment can either manifest or lend assistance to an exercise of the first amendment rights. The possession of arms manifests a choice or a freedom of life style which is consistent with the democratic philosophy. The possession of arms may allow a person, who is otherwise intimidated into submission, alternative choices with respect to where he may go or what he may say. For instance, those who worked on voter registration in the South almost uniformly report that the possession of guns by Southern blacks gave them the necessary confidence to overcome the threats, harassment, burning crosses and sniper shots to which they were frequently subjected. In order to survive and to realize a measurable degree of personal dignity the Southern blacks needed the guns. As a protection, it made it easier to organize and to insist on the exercise of their constitutional rights to vote and speak. Perhaps this was only made possible because the Constitution guaranteed the right to keep and bear arms.

IV. THE INSTITUTION OF CONTROL

The author of "Shooting to Kill" offers many extralegal arguments against citizens' keeping and bearing arms, specifically against the ownership of handguns. These are really irrelevant to the constitutional argument and the associated rationale. Perhaps we should stop there, but other considerations arise. Controls mean regulation. They also mean people to regulate. The police are often proposed for that function. If we return to our Southern example, it is clear that "red-necks" would get guns from sheriffs while black leaders would not. The police have awesome power and discretion in our society and often it is exercised in a way which oppresses the poor and disadvantaged. We live in a society with, perhaps, too many controls and sanctions. In the North, especially in the troubled urban centers, do we need more controls—particularly by the police? To whom would the power to decide who packs a pistol go? Is it not naive to assume that regulation would mean that guns would go to the trustworthy and refusals to the dangerous? When liberals on a campus want licenses for guns to protect themselves against attacks by

thugs, it is the liberals who will be refused as "commies" and perhaps frightened into a silence which their first amendment protection does not prevent. An appeal to the Supreme Court to find that such gun refusal penalizes their political beliefs may be cold comfort too late.

Controls on alcohol, drugs, sex and now guns are very often desired as a method for eliminating a critical social problem (generally a manifestation of more basic problems). But instituting controls now seems to be a futile repetition of a thoroughly disproved assumption, an insistence on naïveté and blindness in the light of experience. The institution of control is attractive because it seems to be such a simple solution, but realistically it is a solution that fails to solve. Freud knew that prohibition would end when it started and even William F. Buckley now worries about whether it makes sense to proscribe pot. If we have trouble preventing poaching, can we not see the infinite difficulty of outlawing pistols? The drug prohibition and control law has only raised the price and the medical risk. The gambling prohibition and control law has sustained organized crime. Similarly, the prohibitions on adults' consensual sexual acts have not prevented them, but perverted society. Considering the fact that guns are easy to manufacture and, thus, would be even more difficult to control, it seems reasonable to conclude that this would be one more item in this list of failures. It would create disasters where we now have only critical problems. Moreover, so many guns are now in circulation it would take eons for them to disappear in significant numbers.

Many other policy arguments about the wisdom of gun controls can be made. Among them is the idea that focusing on guns instead of political and social conditions represents the classic failure of vision. It penalizes items associated with bad results instead of seeking underlying solutions to radical problems. If there is a new propensity to violence, we are cheated out of the energy we need to cure its roots if we concentrate on regulating the items merely associated with that violence. The remarkable fact about riots is that they have included little sniping by citizens and much property destruction.

Lee Harvey Oswald could have found a gun, no matter what the laws. Sirhan Sirhan could have wrapped-up Robert Kennedy's campaign with a homemade zip-gun. Madmen throw acid and bombs as well as spray with bullets. Murderers, in other words, can find many tools. We would do better to turn to the slums and their great hostility, to the causes of mad bombers and assassins, in order to find a means for detecting and curing these ills within constitutional procedures and to find an answer to the ultimate metaphysical question of the eternal destruction in the hearts and souls of men.

In promoting his campaign of gun control, the author of "Shooting to Kill" fails to consider the potential gun control has to destroy other constitutionally protected rights. Gun control laws, like drug control laws, would likely be designed in such a way that they serve both as an excuse to infringe on constitutional guarantees of freedom and to further the power of those who would ignore these freedoms and oppress minority interests. For instance, recent inroads into search and seizure law have been "justified" on the basis of drug detection, for example, when the quantity is easily disposable. In practice, police often break and enter or stop and frisk without notice if their purpose is drug confiscation. Similar incidents are easy to imagine under the proposed gun control legislation. The glorification of police misconduct in movies like "The French Connection," speaks for itself. The ineffectiveness of the results, if, indeed, the targets are drug abuse and crimes against persons and prop-

erty, is an argument against the mistake of abandoning the Constitution for these claims of terror concerning social phenomenon.

Gun-control possesses two alternatives: we either ban guns from all citizens or from some. The National Rifle Association claims only .0035 of the guns in the United States are used in crimes. If guns were banned for all, the power of the police and, perhaps, in some parts of the country, the fear of animals might commence to become alarming. Some "radicals" maintain that we can no longer ignore the possibility that the military could be mobilized to suppress liberties with little effective resistance. If guns were banned for some, the danger, known so well to the poor, will be upon us. The professor who speaks for a liberal cause in a reactionary city will see the others armed and outraged. The slum dweller, preyed upon by crime, police, landlord, welfare department and a host of others, will have only his fear to arm him. Gun control laws, like drug laws, would likely be designed in such a way that they serve to further the power of those who oppress the poor and weak—another excuse to take away further constitutional freedoms.

It has been suggested that guns occasionally facilitate crimes. It is in this context that "Shooting to Kill" is so completely misleading. The Constitution is based on considerations and spelled-out in clauses, whereas "Shooting to Kill" is based on statistics and quotes.

Realizing the difficulty of locating the exact problem together with the complexities involved and the subsequent chance for miscalculated legislation it is no wonder, as the author of "Shooting to Kill" notes, that "20,000 gun regulations have been abysmal failures." In answering the question which follows, "why should one assume that any more would help?" the most sensible response is that one should not.

At least a part of the failure is that the Constitution is based on reasoned principles whereas gun control laws are based on statistical measurement. The inconsistency lies in using an inflexible indicator to gauge the fluctuating variables involved in the "complex ecology of crime." Under these conditions, the reliability of statistics must certainly be suspect. The author of "Shooting to Kill" acknowledges this when he quotes Senator McClure: "Whoever said that statistics can be used to prove anything, understood the real world." Statistics are finite devices used in order to break down complex problems into easily identifiable parts. Reality, however, has no such limits or definitions that are susceptible, with any reliability, to this analysis.

In addition, statistics can easily be abused or distorted to fit the user's purpose. "Shooting to Kill" makes frequent use of statistics from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), while ignoring the simple possibility that they may not be reliable.

For example . . . Albert Biderman, a key commission consultant on statistics, attacked the FBI reports for fostering a false image of rapidly increasing lawlessness and for grossly distorting both the rate and distribution of crime. And another commission consultant, Professor Marvin Wolfgang, detailed in an article the many elements in the FBI reports of "error, omission, inconsistency, contradiction, deficiency, and bias."

An explanation for the fact that statistics are not always reliable is that the FBI, like other sources, has a "vested interest in maintaining the crime wave, not only to get ever-increasing appropriations but also to sustain a constant state of emergency in which they can serve as national savior."

Certainly, in the area of police statistics, there is no question of their great manipulation. In an area like gun possession, the reliability of statistics must certainly be sus-

pect. "Shooting to Kill" acknowledges this fact by noting that discovering how many guns there are in the United States is an impossible task.

Furthermore, to combine statistics is to multiply errors times errors. An attempt to rescue this mathematical mumbo-jumbo by reference to the necessity to include the "influence on crime of factors such as population density, geography, race, per capita income, and education," lets the tiger out of the bag. Police statistics show that the most likely to commit violent crimes and use guns are the slum-crowded, the black, the poor, and people with little education.

A critical question to address is whether gun control laws actually prevent the criminal use of guns. In this respect, the author of "Shooting to Kill" discusses the New York Sullivan Law in contrast to the Texas law. Houston has led the country in homicides, but is that the result of handgun availability or the Texas temperament? In the East, specifically New York City, with the Sullivan Law, the figures on homicide and violence are not much better. If we were to accept the statistics, and say a little better is at least desirable, we would still be left with no reason to believe that the Sullivan Law, instead of the somewhat more bearable life that the poor and the black are allowed in New York City, than in Houston, is the cause of this better effect.

Trying to discern the rationale behind banning only handguns raises further questions. People with some money might buy shotguns if handguns were banned and, in fact, the author of "Shooting to Kill" invites them to do so. Shotguns can be modified or sawed-off. But even unmodified, full-length shotguns could be used to commit murder. The use of the familiar statistic showing murder victims as the relatives or friends of their murderers is impossible to comprehend as an argument for outlawing handguns—no matter how the argument is twisted and mauled.

Handguns are, we are told, "relatively difficult to shoot accurately." Are we sure that we want a country armed with shotguns instead of the less accurate handgun? Do we want the more accurate weapon allowed to people selected by those in various realms of power? Nowhere is there any "textual" support for distinguishing between handguns and rifles in the Constitution.

A hodgepodge of statistics and quotes does not a constitutional argument make. The second amendment speaks clearly. It speaks as other amendments do and it speaks with them. Within its safety, a militia, as well as other good causes, may be served. Let us not chip at the constitutional absolutes in hysteria over dramatic tragedies. Now is the time to keep constitutional commands clear. It is also the time to move in the world of politics in order to provide fruitful outlets for the driving energy of mankind and to remove the frustrations that have chained us to insanity and destruction.

ALEXANDER H. UHL

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding reporter and editor associated with the labor press for many years died recently in Madrid, Spain.

Alexander H. Uhl, whose wife, Gladys, is a longtime dear friend, spent a selfless career in journalism—beginning in 1923 with the Associated Press, later

joining PM and then Public Affairs Institute—dedicated to the best traditions of free peoples everywhere.

At a memorial service in Washington, D.C., on August 30, RICHARD BOLLING delivered the eulogy for Alex Uhl which I wish at this time to share with our colleagues in the House of Representatives:

EULOGY FOR ALEXANDER H. UHL

(By Representative RICHARD BOLLING)

My wife and I have been friends of Alex and Gladys Uhl for a very long time. I first met Alex in the late forties, I can't remember when . . . 1947 or 1948 . . . and I'm really honored to have this privilege.

Alex was an extraordinary man. He was born in New York in 1899. His family was not rich. He had a fine education. I don't know the story before he went to high school but he went to one of those remarkable public high schools that used to exist in cities like New York and Boston. They were for exceptionally gifted students so that the story begins with a gifted student. It's name was Townsend Harris. And he obviously did well. He went on to the City College of New York which was one of the fine colleges in the United States and the Columbia School of Journalism. I think it's significant that through all those college years he worked his way by working in the New York Public Library.

His first job in the newspaper business was with the Newark Star Eagle and he joined the Associated Press in 1923. He was their man in Spain during 1935 and 1938 covering that brutal Spanish civil war.

There's a quote that I want to set right. I'm sure it's well intentioned, but I also know it's untrue. I know it from Alex and I know it from my own knowledge of Alex. The quote says that "It was in Spain that I first developed a social conscience." That's simply not so. I know from knowing him and from talking to him that he'd gone to Spain with a well-developed social conscience. That wasn't what he learned from Spain.

From 1940 to 1948 he was foreign editor and war correspondent in the European Theater for that great experiment in Journalism PM. After PM failed he came to Washington as a writer for the Public Affairs Institute. And in 1954 with Harry Conn founded Press Associates.

He was a great labor reporter and editor.

In 1975 he retired and returned to Spain to fulfill a long ambition and work on a book on the Spanish Civil War which he covered for AP. He had a happy year in Spain . . . he was doing what he wanted to do.

Now that tells us a little of what Alex did but it tells us very little about what he was.

He was one of the most extraordinary men I've ever known because he combined an infinite capacity of relating to individuals with a strength of character and of mind that was rare. He was a very gentle gentleman . . . he was a courtly gentleman. He was kind. He was kind to the young. I could tell you of experiences of his kindness to our children. I've heard of experiences that others had with him when he was kind to them as they were learning their trade or their profession. He always had time to be helpful. He was even on occasion sentimental. He was a loving man.

A city person—a New Yorker, the epitome of a city person—through and through he loved the farm and the cows in Poolesville. He had a wonderful time out there and he didn't seem out of place. I used to watch him with real pleasure (I'm afraid of cows; Alex never was) . . . I used to watch him with real pleasure enjoying himself and then returning to the house to talk about things that were important.

It was really the hardness in Alex that I admired the most. But it was only a hardness of mind.

Much more than all those wonderful human personal qualities that he had, I admired the fact that he was a thorough workman and a careful thinker. He was terribly demanding, particularly of himself. He was a superb reporter, a helpful teacher, and a very very useful advisor to me and I'm sure many others.

Most important of all he was a tough realist. His loving nature, his kindness, even his sentimentality never caused him to lose sight of the realities. From Spain I suspect he sharpened his hatred of totalitarianism and its stupid brutality and wasteful cruelty. In Europe he reinforced his commitment to the worth of freedom and free institutions. From his experience in the fifties and the sixties he saw again as he had in Spain and in Europe and in the depression in the United States the fragility of freedom, the fragility of the institutions which preserve it. His toughness of mind enabled him to see more clearly than most the alternative shapes of the future of the world and free peoples. He knew freedom could be worth war and the preservation of freedom worth death. He was truly that rarity—a wise man with a sense of history whose freshness of mind and ability to look ahead were complemented not limited by his vast experience. We will all miss him and so will the cause of free peoples. To the family and especially to his and our beloved Gladys, our deepest sympathy.

SAUDI MISSILE SALES EXCESSIVE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, 14 of our colleagues today have joined me in introducing resolutions of disapproval to block the sale of three sophisticated missile systems to Saudi Arabia.

Although the formal notifications to the International Relations Committee have been classified by the administration, recent media reports quote administration sources as saying the Saudis are purchasing 850 Sidewinder air-to-air missiles, 650 Maverick TV-guided air-to-surface missiles, and 1,000 TOW anti-tank missiles.

The Saudis do not need this quantity of high-technology weapons. They already have hundreds of Sidewinders, Mavericks, and TOWs—much more than they will ever need against Iraq and South Yemen, their most likely foes according to the Pentagon. These countries are so much weaker than Saudi Arabia that its current resources are more than adequate for defense.

These missiles are part of a \$700 million military sales package for Saudi Arabia sent to the Congress on September 1. They bring the total U.S. military sales to that country for this year to over \$7.5 billion, which is more than half-again as much as the Saudis purchased throughout the entire preceeding 25 years.

These latest arms sales further accelerate Saudi Arabia's emergence as the arsenal of the Arab world and are another step toward making it a confrontation state with Israel. Transfer of the arms to other Arab States is highly likely if another Middle East war erupts. Saudi

leaders have made clear their commitment to the Arab cause.

Moreover, the sale will inevitably further fuel the Persian Gulf arms race, which is already out of control. The presence of so much lethal weaponry encourages its use.

It appears that the U.S. arms sale "policy" toward Saudi Arabia is similar to our Iran "policy"—sell them anything they want.

Saudi Arabia, of course, is the United States chief source of oil—more than 1 million barrels a day. The price of that oil, as everyone knows, has multiplied several times since the 1973 Arab oil embargo when our purchases from Saudi Arabia were about one-fourth the present level.

The following is a list of U.S. military sales to Saudi Arabia for this year, including the current transitional quarter. These figures are conservative because the administration was not required to report to the Congress government-to-government military sales smaller than \$25 million prior to June 30, 1976, and smaller than \$7 million following that date. In addition, there was no requirement for reporting commercial arms sales to the Congress prior to June 30, and there is now a \$25 million floor on reporting such transactions. As a result, this list is probably several hundred million dollars below the actual figures. These items—except for the Hawk missiles—represent formal notifications sent to the Congress by the administration of intention to issue a letter of offer to Saudi Arabia. Section 36(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976 requires the Congress be formally notified 30 days before issuance of a letter of offer. The following is a list of fiscal year 1976 and 76-T notifications:

MILITARY SALES TO SAUDI ARABIA—1976

(a) (Prior to September 1):	Millions
150 M60 tanks.....	\$118.0
1,000+ armored personnel carriers.....	124.0
Vulcan antiaircraft cannon.....	41.0
1,000 Maverick missiles.....	47.0
4,000 Dragon antitank missiles.....	26.0
Al Batain cantonment.....	1,450.0
F-5 program expansion.....	1,500.0
Naval facilities.....	594.0
Ports.....	300.0
National Guard Headquarters.....	158.0
RSAF uniform.....	52.6
Ammunition.....	26.5
Pilot training.....	26.0
Ships—design.....	185.6
Trucks.....	25.3
Patrol gunboats—design.....	276.2
SA Army ordnance management assistance.....	223.3
Cement plant.....	235.0
Hardware.....	869.6
Construction, training.....	4,538.9
Total.....	5,408,500,000

(b) Notifications dated September 1):	
Missiles.....	25.0
Naval training center equipment.....	130.0
Missiles.....	30.0
RSAF headquarters construction.....	160.0

Family housing construction at air base.....	88.0
Armored personnel carriers.....	10.0
Aircraft.....	23.3
Guns.....	12.4
Missiles/launcher.....	7.9
National Guard modernization, training.....	215.0
Hardware.....	238.6
Construction, training.....	463.0

Total..... 701,600,000

1976 total to date, government to government.....	6,110,100,000
1976 commercial sale of Hawk missiles.....	1,400,000,000

Total..... 7,510,100,000

1950-76 total..... 4,612,000,000

1950-76 total..... 12,122,100,000

Sponsors of the resolutions of disapproval are:

Hon. Bella Abzug (D-N.Y.).
 Hon. Jonathan Bingham (D-N.Y.).
 Hon. J. Herbert Burke (R-Fla.).
 Hon. John Burton (D-Calif.).
 Hon. Robert Drinan (D-Mass.).
 Hon. Dante Fascell (D-Fla.).
 Hon. Benjamin Gilman (R-N.Y.).
 Hon. Michael Harrington (D-Mass.).
 Hon. Toby Moffett (D-Conn.).
 Hon. Donald Riegle (D-Mich.).
 Hon. Benjamin Rosenthal (D-L, N.Y.).
 Hon. Stephen Solarz (D-N.Y.).
 Hon. Fortney Stark (D-Calif.).
 Hon. Henry Waxman (D-Calif.).
 Hon. Lester Wolff (D-N.Y.).

GIRLS SOFTBALL—THIRD BEST TEAM IN WORLD

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on August 31 this year, the Council of Columbus, Ga., my hometown, adopted a resolution singing the praises of the 1976 Pioneer Little League Softball All-Stars for this team's outstanding performance, which took it all the way to Portland, Oreg., for the 1976 Softball World Series.

The Pioneer All-Stars thus became the first team from Georgia ever to make it all the way to the World Series playoffs, and we are all justifiably proud of them. They represented us not only as a superb example of expert teamwork, but as a demonstration of ability, sportsmanship and character.

It was my honor to be at the Columbus Metropolitan Airport when the Pioneers returned from Portland. Parents and supporters were on hand, as were television cameras and sportswriters. When the team arrived home, there was an outpouring of joy, of sentiment, something that seemed really special. The atmosphere was charged.

And I cannot let the opportunity pass to tell a little story on the Pioneer League, which I think demonstrates the justifiable, but humble pride of this group of young people. It seems that during our local playoffs, the leagues were

trying to outdo each other with their claims to athletic excellence, and banners being waved in the stands was evidence of this.

One league's banner read, "We're the finest ball club in Columbus." Another's said, "We're the finest ball club in Georgia." A third proclaimed, "We're the finest ball club in the United States." But the Pioneer League limited itself to the modest, although prophetic claim, "We're the best ball club on this field."

So they were, and we are proud of them. On October 6, I will be presenting the members of the team Youth Advisory Council certificates at a banquet being held in their honor. Mr. Speaker, I place in the Record a copy of the Columbus Council resolution honoring the Pioneer Little Leaguers.

COLUMBUS COUNCIL RESOLUTION

A resolution expressing appreciation of the Council for meritorious service rendered Columbus by the 1976 Pioneer Little League Softball All-Stars.

Whereas, the 1976 Pioneer Little League Softball All-Stars, have won the District Eight, Georgia, State, Southern Divisional, and Southeastern Regional Tournaments; and,

Whereas, this team of Pioneer Softball All-Stars participated in the 1976 Softball World Series in Portland, Oregon, the very first team from Columbus or from the State of Georgia ever to make it all the way to World Series competition level; and,

Whereas, this team of All-Stars won more tournament games than any other team ever from Columbus in any of its youth programs, and,

Whereas, the members of this team and the Pioneer League have acted as ambassadors of good will for the City of Columbus in their very able demonstration of good athletic ability, good character, fair play and sportsmanship.

Now, therefore, the Council of Columbus, Georgia hereby resolves:

That this Council hereby expresses its appreciation for the great achievements of this team of All-Stars and for the good will and understanding created for this city by their many sacrifices and accomplishments.

Let a copy of this Resolution be furnished to each of the team members, manager, coach, League president, and the Honorable Jack Brinkley, Congressman of the Third Congressional District of Georgia, as set forth below as an expression of the appreciation of the citizens of Columbus, Georgia for this service:

Players, Charlene Bowers, Kim Collins, Lee Cruse, Stephanie Davis, Dana Griggs, Jean Hatcher, Debra Holy, Ginny Lee, Debbie McCoy, Dianna McIntosh, Leslie Morrow, Kerri Ray, Beth Tanner, and Vicky Thomas.

Manager, Joy Brooks.

Coach, Rodney Brooks.

League President, Ray Pawelski.

CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES, BENEFITS, ALLOWANCES, EXPENSES

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, although Members of Congress should not be preoccupied with administrative considerations—certainly it would be false economy to pinch pennies at the expense

of properly serving our constituents—I believe each of us has a duty to operate our offices efficiently and frugally. For this reason, I have prepared the following information and commentary about congressional salaries, benefits, and allowances generally and some specific details on the operation of my own office during 1975. I plan to make this report available to residents of the Fifth Congressional District who express an interest.

SALARIES AND BENEFITS

Members of Congress are paid an annual salary of \$44,700, an increase from the \$42,500 level which prevailed at the time of the last election. As one who disapproved the increase, for reasons I have previously discussed at length, it seemed inappropriate for me to personally benefit from a salary increase to which I objected as a matter of principle. I therefore intended to forego the raise for the balance of this term.

However, I was advised there is no legal basis for the Sergeant at Arms to reduce the amount of a Member's salary. It was suggested, in lieu of this procedure, that I could merely return the difference as a contribution to the Government—in other words, as a gift. After reflecting, however, upon the waste and extravagance of the Federal Government, this did not seem a particularly attractive idea. Instead I have made a contribution in an amount equivalent to the salary increase, from the date of increase to the end of my term, to certain private charitable causes which seem particularly worthwhile and deserving.

Group life insurance coverage is automatically provided—monthly payroll deduction of \$38.76—unless declined. Members are eligible to participate in the civil service retirement system—payroll deduction of 8 percent. Limited medical services are provided without cost in the Capitol while health insurance coverage is available on a voluntary basis. I participate in group life and retirement coverage, decline health insurance.

FACILITIES

Each Member is furnished space—usually three rooms—in one of the House office buildings in Washington and is entitled to one or more offices in his home district. I maintain two such offices: one in Aurora, the other in Colorado Springs. Office furnishings, decorations, plants, and various services—research, maintenance, folding, radio-television, and so forth—are also provided. Parking facilities are furnished to each Member and some staff.

In Washington, each office is permitted to have no more than \$5,500—depreciated value—of electrical and mechanical equipment such as typewriters, dictating equipment, et cetera. Members are also authorized to use leased equipment up to \$650 per month; provided, however, that up to \$250 of clerk hire staff funds may also be used for lease equipment. Each district office is entitled to lesser amounts of equipment.

STAFF ALLOWANCE

Each Member of Congress is allowed up to \$220,686—until October 1, 1975, then it was increased to \$238,584—per

year to employ staff. During 1975 staff in my offices was paid \$175,994.53.

MAILING

Members of Congress are permitted to mail under frank—that is, under their own signature—and, in addition, are supplied some regular postage stamps. During 1975 my office did not receive any such postage.

TELEPHONE

Each office is permitted to use up to 125,000 units of long distance telephone service—each minute of long distance service equals 4 units—per Congress. During 1975, my office used 68,747 units. Each office is also given access to a Federal Tele-Communications System line, without charge against the unit allowance, for long distance telephoning before 9 a.m. and after 5 p.m. on weekdays and Government holidays. District office telephone service consists of full-time FTS service and commercial telephone.

TRAVEL

Members of Congress receive reimbursement for one round trip between the Member's home district and Washington at the beginning of each session. During each Congress, Members are permitted reimbursement for up to 26 additional round trips. Each office is also allowed a maximum of 6 round trips for staff travel.

During 1975, I was reimbursed for 22 round trips—\$6,030.91—and members of my staff were reimbursed for a total of three such trips—\$773.56.

OTHER ALLOWANCES

Each Member is given \$6,500 per regular session to cover the cost of stationery and office supplies and \$500 per quarter for district office expenses. These allowances are taxable income but Members are permitted to deduct the actual cost of expenses incurred whether more or less than the allowances. The following is a summary of allowances and expenses in my office during 1975:

Allowances:	
Travel	\$6,804.47
Stationery	6,500.00
District office	2,000.00
Telephone	1,331.77
Miscellaneous	2,267.68
Total	18,903.92
Expenses:	
Travel	5,563.34
Office supplies	7,978.66
Dues, subscriptions	1,437.73
District office	1,569.57
Telephone	1,402.69
Entertainment	820.72
Miscellaneous	1,880.64
Total	20,653.35
Total	(1,749.43)

CONCLUSIONS

All in all, the taxpayers are providing generous salary, benefits, facilities, and allowances to Members of Congress. Whether each of us is giving our district a commensurate degree of service is up to voters in our districts to decide.

However, at least one aspect of congressional costs poses a national policy issue—the way these salaries and benefits are established and raised by backdoor methods. I strongly disapprove of this technique; and therefore, I am pleased

by recent House action to preclude spending any of the funds in the legislative appropriation bill to pay the cost of salary increases granted in this manner. However, despite the amendment to the legislative bill, the basic system under which salaries are adjusted remains unchanged, a shortcoming that should be corrected soon.

TROTSKYISM AND TERRORISM: PART VII—TERRORIST ACTIVITIES IN EUROPE—CONTINUED

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Trotskyite Communist Fourth International is actively supporting terrorism and organizing proterrorist parties in other European countries.

SPAIN

There are two Fourth International sections in Spain. One, the Liga Comunista—Communist League—supports the Socialist Workers Party, U.S.A. and its Leninist-Trotskyist faction. The other, Liga Comunista Revolucionaria—Euzkadi ta Azkatasuna (VI) (LCR-ETA (VI)) translated Revolutionary Communist League—Land and Freedom VI—supports the "terrorism now" International Majority Tendency. The latter was formed by a merger of the Trotskyite LCR with the Basque terrorist ETA (VI) early in 1974.¹

When a rival ETA faction, ETA (V), assassinated the Spanish Prime Minister, Luis Carrero Blanco, in December 1973, LCR-ETA (VI) expressed public support for the grotesque murder. The official newspaper of the British Fourth International section, Red Weekly, headlined their January 11, 1974, issue "Spanish Trotskyists Give Total Support to Carrero Blanco's Assassination."

PORTUGAL

The official Fourth International section in Portugal is called the Liga Comunista Internacionalista (LCI) (International Communist League). Another group has recently surfaced called Partido Revolucionario dos Trabalhadores (Revolutionary Workers Party) which is mainly based among militant high school students.² Attempts are being made to merge the two groups.

On October 31, 1975, the Central Committee of the LCI complained to the leadership of the Fourth International that the two representatives of the United Secretariat operating in Portugal, Comrades Aubin and Duret, had been organizing a faction within LCI.³ "Comrade Duret" has been identified as A. Udry, a member of the Fourth International Executive Committee from Switzerland. "Aubin" is Charles Michaloux, one of the most active proponents of international terrorism now in the French Fourth International section.

GREECE

The International Communist Party is the Greek section of the Fourth International. One of its active members, Theologos Psaradelles, was prosecuted

for breaking into a military depot and stealing explosives. He was arrested in 1969, tried in 1970 and sentenced to a 12-year term.

He told the court:

I am a worker and a member of the Fourth International. This precise class and political position has led me onto the road of struggle against oppression and into attempting to give a correct orientation to the Greek and world workers.

I am accused of attempting to overthrow the state by force and violence. I do not deny it. ***

These are my aims and they are the aims of the Fourth Communist International to which I belong.

Psaradelles concluded:

In the end, the working class and the oppressed masses will destroy the barbaric capitalistic system, which brings only misfortunes, hunger, and wars. On the ruins of capitalism they will build the United Socialist Republics of the World.

Try us, but wait. A fire is consuming everything. It is burning under your feet, above you, around you. You and your masters will not escape it.

Long live the world working class!

Long live the Fourth International!

Long live the World Socialist Revolution!⁴

FOOTNOTES

¹ Report by Mary-Alice Waters to the SWP National Committee, June 23, 1974, *Internal Information Bulletin*, #8 in 1974, August 1974.

² *International Internal Discussion Bulletin*, Vol. XII, #6, October 1975, p. 11.

³ Memorandum to Leninist-Trotskyist Faction Steering Committee from Mary-Alice Waters, November 1, 1975; Appendix contains text of letter.

⁴ *Intercontinental Press*, Vol. 8, #36, November 2, 1970, p. 935.

SENATE—Thursday, September 9, 1976

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JESSE HELMS, a Senator from the State of North Carolina.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, our need leads us to Thee. Thou art perfect and we are imperfect, holy and we are unholy, strong and we are weak. We need Thee every hour, most gracious Lord. Remove from us whatever barrier keeps us from knowing Thee, loving Thee, and serving Thee. If we have been evil in thought, careless in speech, rude in attitude, God of all mercy forgive us. Find us where we are in our wanderings, lead us to where fountains of living waters flow, shepherd us to the green pastures, and nourish us with the truth of Thy Word.

Be unto us as the new day, fresh as the air at dawn, bright as the sun at midday. Hold us for in Thee we live and move and have our being. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the

Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,

PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D.C., September 9, 1976.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JESSE HELMS, a Senator from the State of North Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HELMS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, September 8, 1976, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of items on the

calendar beginning with Calendar No. 1145 and ending with Calendar No. 1155.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FARM AND FOOD POLICY

The resolution (S. Res. 531) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "Farm and Food Policy," was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry one thousand four hundred additional copies of its committee print of the current session entitled "Farm and Food Policy—1977".

SERVICE OF WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 513) providing for the printing of a compilation of materials commemorating the years of service of Justice William O. Douglas, was considered and agreed to.

REVIEW OF NATIONAL BREEDER REACTOR PROGRAM

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 592) authorizing the printing of two